

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

IN the midst of the discursive and somewhat depressing articles in the current number of *The Hibbert Journal*, it is a relief to find one with this title: 'The Kingdom of the Little Child.'

Is it an exposition of our Lord's words about the Child and the Kingdom? That is not likely; no one who reads *The Hibbert Journal* is likely to expect that and be disappointed. It is rather an essay on the advantage of being always young. Indeed, the first part of it seems to say that if one is to be anything of an originator—what men call a genius—one must resolve, like Peter Pan, never to grow up.

Ruskin and Rousseau and Scott grew up, but how sorry they were for it. Did they not all dwell affectionately in their autobiographies, and at most disproportionate length (Scott never got beyond it), on their childhood? Dickens remained a child, and confessed how good it was, especially at Christmas. Was not Shelley a child 'in his divine carelessness, his swift obedience to instinct, his contempt for conventionality, his playfulness and Homeric laughter? Rossetti—people marvel at this prodigy of five enjoying *Hamlet*; but Rossetti never was much older. And Voltaire—but Voltaire was not the child those others were; he was that other species of

child called by the French *l'enfant terrible*. So Mr. J. W. MARRIOTT, who writes the article, reminds us: *l'enfant terrible*, he says, is the best description of the genius of Voltaire.

Did not Kingsley, however, boast that he was always a child? With childlike abandonment he exerted all his energies in whatever he was doing, whether preaching, fishing, writing, agitating, collecting plants, seeking fossils, or romping with his children under the fir-trees at Eversley. And what incident is more delightful than the story of how once, after dining with tedious and solemn persons, he threw off his clerical coat and raced a doctor in climbing a tree!

But R. L. Stevenson is the supreme instance of one who was a schoolboy all his life—a schoolboy in his sublime in consequence, his spontaneity, his love of the dramatic and theatrical, his appetite for bloodthirsty adventure, his Bohemian carelessness and devil-may-care recklessness; above all, in his exhilarating and contagious enthusiasm. We like to think of him at the age of thirty playing with tin soldiers, and at thirty-six composing music for the tin-whistle. 'There's no sense in the grown-up business,' he said.

But, now, can Mr. MARRIOTT tell us what it is to be a child? He says he can.

First, he says, it is *to have the sense of fear*. The sense of fear, he assures us, is very intense in childhood, and whatever else it does, it certainly makes life tremendous. Every dark room contains spirits bigger and blacker than those of any goblin tale. A lonely (and sensitive) child dreams of more hells than Swedenborg, and they are more hideous than the Infernos of Virgil and Dante. As we grow older fear disappears. Or we only fear lest the air should be full of germs. And all the thrill of adventure has gone out of life.

Next, it is *to be a hero-worshipper*. This follows upon the sense of fear. If we fear giants we must worship Jack the Giant-killer. And when the hobgoblin goes, Jack is no longer a hero. As we grow up, we sadly see King Arthur and all the Round Table sail down the other side of our horizon.

Thirdly, it is *to know the joy of life*. The leaping and exulting delight in the mere fact of being alive—that, says Mr. MARRIOTT, is known only to children. Browning knew it and Walt Whitman, and all the optimists have known it from Isaiah to Shelley, and so they have all been children, and never grew up. Children like things repeated endlessly. 'Do it again; do it again,' they cry. But the grown-up is bored after the first time. And then Mr. MARRIOTT dares to quote Mr. Chesterton's daring words that God is always a child, for does He not always keep saying 'Do it again'? There is a creative word every time a bird lays an egg, every time.

There is another mark of the child. He is *bewildered at the presence of evil*. The study of a child's face on his first encounter with evil is a lesson difficult to forget.

We did not expect an exposition of the Master's words about the necessity of becoming a child before entrance into the Kingdom. And yet. The sense of fear? It is the first step always, though you may call it reverence. 'Put off

thy shoes—come now, and I will send thee unto Pharaoh.'

Hero-worship? It was the Apostles' answer always to the question, What must I do to be saved?—'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ.' The belief in the hero has been the acceptance of the hero's qualities. Was there ever a hero like Jesus? And 'that Christ may dwell in your hearts by faith'—was there ever a more uplifting self-annihilating aspiration?

The joy of life—'Rejoice in the Lord always: and again I say, Rejoice.'

Bewilderment at the presence of evil—it is the never-ending wonder of the member of the Kingdom of God. Especially when the evil is in himself.

Why do we speak so much of receiving blessings from God, and why do we receive so very few blessings? The answer is easy. It is easy to both parts of the question. We speak much because we know that every good and perfect gift must come down from above. We receive so little because we do not ask, and because we do not share.

The Rev. Arthur W. ROBINSON, D.D., has written a book called *The Voice of Joy and Health* (Cassell 3s. 6d.). For he believes that the Christian life ought to be full of good, and the two chief blessings of life he can think of are joy and health. Now in that book he has to consider this most undeniable and yet most staggering fact that the children of men pass through life with the very minimum of joy and health, and he has discovered that the reasons are these two—they do not ask, and they do not share.

They do not ask. Yet it is a law that God's blessings must be sought. If we want them, we must ask Him for them. No principle, says Dr.

ROBINSON, is more plainly laid down for us in the Bible. And he quotes some of the passages: 'Ask me, and I will give thee the heathen for thine inheritance' (Ps 2⁸). 'I will do it . . . yet for his will I be inquired of to do it for them' (Ezk 36^{36f.}). 'If ye then being evil know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Father which is in heaven give good things to them that ask him' (Mt 7¹¹). 'If thou knewest the gift of God, thou wouldest have asked, and he would have given' (Jn 4¹⁰). 'Ask, and ye shall receive' (Jn 16²⁴). 'Ye have not, because ye ask not' (Ja 4²).

Why must we ask? Dr. ROBINSON gives two reasons. The first is, that this is part of the law of labour under which we live. Nothing can be done without effort—somebody's effort. Nothing can be done for us permanently without our own effort. And the other is, that this is part of the law of liberty under which we are placed. 'The best things are not forced upon us. In one of His lessons on the subject of prayer, our Lord points to a difference between the action of the forces of good and of evil. The evil spirit is rude and inconsiderate. It intrudes unbidden. When it has been expelled, it insists upon returning with violence the moment it sees a chance. The heavenly Father cannot act thus. He is most willing to "give the Holy Spirit," but it must be "to them that ask him"' (Lk 11¹³).

But not only must we ask God's blessings, we must also share them. Dr. ROBINSON does not know any greater fallacy than the idea that when a thing has to be divided the more persons there are to receive a share the less there will be for each. He thinks we are growing out of that fallacy. It still possesses the popular mind, but even in the popular mind he thinks doubts are beginning to make themselves felt as to 'the possibility of applying such crude arithmetic to the problems of vital experience.' Even where material gains are concerned, he believes there is a growing suspicion that things lose nearly all their value

and charm when we use them selfishly, when we try to wall them off, and keep them to ourselves alone. Some day we shall all agree that the real worth of anything is to be measured by the extent to which we can enjoy it with others.

But it is when we pass up to the higher levels of experience that the working of this law becomes most clearly manifested. And with its manifestation there appears 'the most far-reaching change that has occurred in our time.' What is that? It is the discovery of society. After three centuries of increasing individualism we are come at last to a belief in the possibilities of corporate life. Of course we have known, or at least we have said, that Union is Strength. What we now know, or at least have begun to know, is the far more fertile truth that Unity is Life.

'In consideration of Akhnaton's peculiar ability and originality there seems considerable likelihood that he is the author of this gem of the Psalter.' What gem of the Psalter? The 104th Psalm. And who is Akhnaton? One of the Pharaohs of Egypt.

The words occur in a book entitled *The Life and Times of Akhnaton, Pharaoh of Egypt*, written by Mr. Arthur E. P. WEIGALL, Chief Inspector of the Department of Antiquities, Upper Egypt (Blackwood). Having assisted at the discovery of Akhnaton's mummy in 1907, Mr. WEIGALL was led to investigate the history of this Egyptian ruler. He found it to be one of the most remarkable histories in the world, and Akhnaton to be one of the most remarkable men.

Professor BREASTED in his *History of Egypt* calls Akhnaton 'the first individual in human history.' Mr. WEIGALL understands that to mean that he is the first historical figure whose personality is known to us. He himself adds that Akhnaton 'may be ranked in degree of time, and perhaps also in degree of genius, as the world's first

idealist, and he says that in all ancient Oriental research there never has been, and probably never will be, brought before us a subject of such intellectual interest as this Pharaoh's religious revolution, which marks the first point in the study of advanced human thought.

Akhnaton belongs to the eighteenth dynasty of Egyptian kings. That dynasty took possession of the throne of the Pharaohs in the year 1580 B.C. The founder of the dynasty was Aahmes I. Its greatest warrior was Thothmes III., who raised the prestige of Egypt to a point never before attained and never again. Thothmes III. was the great-great-grandfather of Akhnaton.

At this time Thebes was the capital of Egypt; and the god Amon, originally merely the tribal god of that city had been raised to the dignity of State god of the country. In earlier times the State god had been Ra (or Ra-Horakhti). Ra was originally the deity of Heliopolis, a city not far from the modern Cairo. And at the time that the priests of Amon desired to give their own god the supremacy, Ra, the Sun-god, was so generally worshipped as supreme that they found it advisable to identify the two gods under the double name of Amon-Ra. But Amon was not a sun-god. He was probably, like other gods, only a deified chieftain of the prehistoric period. The true sun-god was Ra. As the rising and the setting sun—that is to say, the sun near the horizon—he was called Ra-Horakhti. At dawn he was called Khepera. And at sunset he took the name of Atum, a name derived from the Syrian Adon, which means 'Lord.' This name Atum, otherwise Aton, is to be kept in mind. It is the second half of the name of Akhnaton.

The great Thothmes III. was succeeded by Amonhotep II., and Amonhotep II. by Thothmes IV., both of whom maintained the conquests won by Thothmes III. in Asia. When Thothmes IV. came to the throne he found the priests at Heliopolis chafing against the growing power of the

priests of Thebes and the god Amon, and striving to restore the ancient prestige of their own god Ra. Thothmes, there is reason to believe, supported them; but the Theban priesthood proved too powerful. Amon, under the name of Amon-Ra became firmly established as the great god of the land. And when Akhnaton came to the throne he had been so long and so widely recognized as the State god that his supremacy seemed beyond the possibility of challenge. Yet his supremacy was challenged and his powerful priesthood defied and that in favour of a god of foreign origin and quite indefinite characteristics. The challenge came from a lad of seventeen or eighteen years of age whose name was Akhnaton.

In this book Mr. WEIGALL shows to what height of ideal thought, and to what profundities of religious and moral philosophy, this boy, in the year of his early manhood, attained; and it but enhances our respect for his abilities when he reaches maturity, if we find in his early training all manner of shortcomings. The beautiful doctrines of the religion with which this Pharaoh's name is identified were productions of his later days; and until he was at least seventeen years of age neither his exalted monotheism nor any of his future principles were really apparent. Some time after the eighth year of his reign one finds that he had evolved a religion so pure that one must compare it with Christianity in order to discover its faults; and yet this superb theology was in no sense derived from his education.

The struggle, as has been said, was between Amon and Aton. The god Aton, the Adonis of Asia Minor, was no doubt a foreign god, and was chosen for that very reason to be the supreme name in the religion which Akhnaton founded. For it was not a god that he wanted, but a divine principle or power above all gods. And this name with its less familiar associations could be better adapted to that purpose than the name of any of the local gods of Egypt. No doubt also he was influenced in his choice of name by the fact that

mother Tiy, a woman of strong force of character, as well as his wife Nefertiti, to whom he was tenderly attached, were of Syrian extraction. But the fact that the god was a foreigner made it the more difficult for Akhnaton to substitute a new worship identified with his name for the ancient Egyptian worship of the god Amon.

If the struggle was not of long duration, it was extremely bitter while it lasted. Akhnaton was compelled to change the residence of the Court. With that, and the change of his own name, for he had originally been called Amonhotep, the breach was complete. Henceforth he could develop his Religion at will, watched only at a distance by the defiled but still powerful and revengeful body of priests in Thebes.

(Originally Aton (or 'the Aton,' for the word is simply 'Lord,' and may be used with or without the article) was the actual sun's disk. But now Akhnaton—he was nineteen or twenty when he founded his new city and religion—called the object of his worship 'Heat-which-is-in-Aton,' and drew the eyes of his followers to a force far more intangible and distant than the dazzling orb of the sun itself. Akhnaton's conception of God, as we now begin to observe it, was as the power which created the sun, the energy which penetrated to his earth in the sun's heat and caused all things to grow. At the present day the scientist will tell you that God is the ultimate source of life, that where a natural explanation fails there God is to be found: He is, in a word, the author of energy, the primal motive-power of all known things. Akhnaton, centuries upon centuries before the birth of the scientist, defined God in just this manner. In an age when men believed, as some do still, that a deity was but an exaggerated creature of this earth, having a form built on material lines, this youthful pharaoh proclaimed God to be the formless essence, the intelligent germ, the loving force, which permeated time and space.

'The Aton,' says Mr. WEIGALL, 'is God as we

conceive Him. There is no quality attributed by the king to the Aton which we do not attribute to our God. Like a flash of blinding light in the night-time the Aton stands out for a moment amidst the black Egyptian darkness, and disappears once more,—the first signal to this world of the future religion of the West. No man whose mind is free from prejudice will fail to see a far closer resemblance to the teaching of Christ in the religion of Akhnaton than in that of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. The faith of the patriarchs is the lineal ancestor of the Christian faith; but the creed of Akhnaton is its isolated prototype. One might believe that Almighty God had for a moment revealed Himself to Egypt, and had been more clearly, though more momentarily, interpreted there than ever He was in Syria or Palestine before the time of Christ.'

Amon and the old gods of Egypt were, for the most part, but deified mortals, endowed with monstrous, though limited, powers, and still having around them traditions of aggrandized human deeds. Others had their origin in natural phenomena: the wind, the Nile, the starry heavens, and the like. All were terrific or revengeful, if so they had a mind to be, and all were able to be moved by human emotions. But to Akhnaton, although he had absolutely no precedent upon which to launch his thoughts, God was the intangible and yet ever-present Father of mankind, made manifest in sunshine. The youthful high-priest called upon his subjects to search for their God, not in the confusion of battle or behind the smoke of human sacrifices, but amidst the flowers and the trees, amidst the wild duck and the fishes. Like a greater than he, Akhnaton taught his disciples to address their maker as their 'Father which art in Heaven.' The Aton was the joy which caused the young sheep 'to dance upon their legs,' and the birds 'to flutter in their marshes.' He was the god of the simple pleasures of life; and although Akhnaton himself was indeed a man of sorrows, plenteously acquainted with grief, happiness was the watchword which he gave to his followers.

The Aton was 'the Lord of Love.' He was the tender nurse who 'creates the man-child in woman, and soothes him that he may not weep'; whose love, to use an Egyptian phrase of exquisite tenderness, 'makes the hands to faint.' His beams were 'beauteous with love' as they fell upon His people and upon His city, 'very rich in love.' 'Thy love is great and large,' says one of Akhnaton's psalms. 'Thou fillest the two lands of Egypt with Thy love'; and another passage runs: 'Thy rays encompass the lands. . . . Thou bindest them with Thy love.'

And now it is time that we had returned to the 104th Psalm. In the tombs of rich persons who had lived and died previous to the time of Akhnaton, a large portion of the walls had been covered with religious inscriptions; and when at first the nobles of the new City were planning their sepulchres they must have been at a loss to know what to substitute for these forbidden formulæ. Soon, however, it became the custom to write there short extracts from the hymns which were sung in the temples of the Aton. In a few cases these inscriptions supply us with a definite psalm which, although short, seems to be complete. In one tomb—that of Ay—however, there is a copy of a much more elaborate hymn.

It is this hymn that Mr. WEIGALL offers as the original of Psalm 104. That Akhnaton himself was the author of it there is no reason to doubt. Mr. WEIGALL sets portions of it and of the Psalm in parallel columns.

AKHNATON'S HYMN.

The world is in darkness like the dead. Every lion cometh forth from his den; all serpents sting. Darkness reigns.

PSALM civ.

Thou makest the darkness and it is night, wherein all creep forth. The young lions roar after their prey; they seek their meat from God.

AKHNATON'S HYMN.

When Thou risest in the horizon . . . the darkness is banished. . . . Then in all the world they do their work.

All trees and plants flourish, . . . the birds flutter in their marshes. . . . All sheep dance upon their feet.

The ships sail up-stream and down-stream alike. . . . The fish in the river leap up before Thee; and Thy rays are in the midst of the great sea.

How manifold are all Thy works! . . . Thou didst create the earth according to Thy desire,—men, all cattle, . . . all that are upon the earth. . . .

Thou hast set a Nile in heaven that it may fall for them, making floods upon the mountains . . . and watering their fields. The Nile in heaven is for the service of the strangers, and for the cattle of every land.

Thou makest the seasons. . . . Thou hast made the distant heaven in order to rise therein, . . . dawning, shining afar off, and returning.

The world is in Thy hand, even as Thou hast made them. When Thou hast risen they live; when Thou settest they die. . . . By Thee man liveth.

PSALM civ.

The sun riseth, they get them away, and lay them down in their dens. Man goeth forth unto his work, and to his labour until the evening.

The trees of the Lord are full of sap, . . . wherein the birds make their nests. . . . The high hills are a refuge for the wild goats.

Yonder is the sea, great and wide, wherein are . . . both small and great beasts. There go the ships. . . .

O Lord, how manifold are Thy works! In wisdom has Thou made them all. The earth is full of Thy creatures.

He watereth the hills from above: the earth is filled with the fruit of Thy works. He bringeth forth grass for the cattle, and green herb for the service of men.

He appointed the moon for certain seasons, and the sun knoweth his going down.

These wait all upon Thee . . . When Thou givest them [food] they gather it; and when Thou openest Thy hand they are filled with good. When Thou hidest Thy face they are troubled: when Thou takest away their breath they die.

Now even so conservative a critic as KIRKPATRICK holds that the 104th Psalm, if it was composed by a Hebrew, could not have been composed earlier than the Exile. Akhnaton lived and died before the time of the Exodus.

The Objective Value of Prayer.

BY THE REV. ARTHUR HOYLE, ABERDEEN.

PROBABLY there is less difficulty in the average mind concerning the objective value of prayer, in our day, than at any time within the last fifty years. Slowly, but surely, the mind and heart of man are stealing out from the dreary prison-house of mere law. We are beginning to see and to feel that the system and order of the universe have by no means opened to us their last secrets. There is still a place for wonder, and hope, and appeal, and that place seems to grow wider, more alluring, more surely founded. It is founding itself, not merely in the imagination of the devout, not merely as a pavilion in the darkness for them that have sorrow; but upon the wisdom, and purity, and humility of many strong and clear minds who have begun to find hints and gleams of another order shooting through the physical. More learning is making science less mad. The religious mind is no longer pitied, not even patronized; it is cheered on its way with a most pathetic directness and simplicity. Surely it is no longer necessary to attack unbelieving theories. It never was necessary to attack men. But in our time there is no unbelieving theory that is confidently held or aggressively preached by any considerable number of apostles. Science is tentative—consciously so. The immeasurable world is more with it than are its own conquests, and the sense of infinite hope has begun to kindle.

We can come back, therefore, to the affirmations of Christ and find them not alien to the age. He no longer speaks into a void, and no longer need we hesitate about plain speech as to His attitude. That attitude is accepted as among the facts to be considered, even by those who are immersed in other orders of thought. It is true His word is not received with the same conclusiveness as it finds in the Christian; but humbly, and gladly, and with some spring of hope, many profoundly scientific minds look towards Christ and would meekly learn His wisdom concerning prayer. That He believes prayer to have an objective value is beyond doubt. When we have made all possible allowance for the time, for the Oriental outlook, for the type of mind to which He addressed Himself, there remains a cheerful and most

buoyant faith that prayer is nothing less than invincible. We may sometimes find ourselves doubting concerning its largeness, its simplicity, its radiant optimism. We may wonder, and, halting upon our wonder, we may ask ourselves whether these things can be; but no man can put aside the witness that Christ bears. Most of our expositions err on the side of going about to provide limitations that are not there. We read life as it appears to us; we consult treatises or profound systems of philosophy; we immerse ourselves in ethical discussion; then, full of these things, we take up the words of Christ and wish to harmonize them with all we have discovered. The result is, we are driven to make much of phrases, of chance remarks, of mysterious limitations, and the much we make is all with the intent of staining somewhat the white radiance of His eternity. We cannot believe in our Father which is in heaven, with His invincible triumph. The wine of His confidence is too strong for us—or we think it is. We dare not drink it—new, with Him. Sometimes it happens that, after much schooling, through long years of sorrow, some pure heart will make the adventure of His chalice; and His chalice vindicates itself. But for the most part, the most devout minds must carefully discriminate and be not quite so buoyant as the Master. It is true that so many ungovernable enthusiasms have found root for wild poisonous growths in the wideness of the words of Jesus, that a modest and an anxious mind may well take thought. But from whatever point of view we approach the matter, it is abundantly plain that Jesus flung wide the gates, made most prodigious offers, called men with amazing cordiality to possess, through prayer, whatsoever they should ask in His name. And have not theologians made hedges and boundaries, divisions and impoverishments, out of 'in His name,' that would amaze His gentle heart, His wide and daring sympathy?

The whole matter is only to be determined by experience. We do well to make much of the words of Jesus and to take His attitude as conclusive. But no word is ever an end of controversy,—only the personal touch, the individual try and the individual finding. We believe when we know.

The example of Jesus is enough to push forward all loyal-hearted followers to make the adventure, on His word; but the adventure is the only finality. There may be those who have so identified their whole being with Him, who are so in Christ that their nature seems impregnate and suffused with His consciousness; and it may be that these blessed ones know from communion rather than experiment, have an instinct that follows Him whithersoever He goeth, follows His every word with no sense of risk or toil, only with an inimitable repose, that is constant confirmation; but for the rest of the world, the call is from above, and they can only stretch lame hands of faith, making sure by the grasp and the holding. No man can pray by authority; each man prays by need and instinct. Hope leans on authority; but it only lives on experience. We watch the prevailing of Christ, and our hearts tell us we are not as He is: His rights are not ours. Outlaws and broken men do not share with the king's children. Our hearts tell us this: but when the outlaws and broken men venture where the king's children are only supposed to come, and find that they are better dealt with, have mercies given that the king's children never required, have their ill desert met in a way that bewilders and dissolves the spirit—then the suspicious heart is silenced into song. It is not only by praying that men learn how to pray, but also by praying that they learn the philosophy of prayer, are rooted and grounded in the knowledge of it. It may be that the roots are hidden, that the foundations have not been recognized, that the rooted and grounded man is inarticulate, is confused and stammering before a gainsayer, but he hath the witness in himself and consciously believes. Like his Lord he prays in the shadow as in the sunlight, and in him is no darkness at all. But to the man that will not pray, and pray with a guileless heart, there must always be something lacking of the evidence. All the lines of thought come a little short. They travel from all points, from every direction, round the compass they converge upon the centre. But they do not meet—the centre is bare, and white, and open. Into the 'bare, and white, and open,' whosoever ventures in a habit of guileless prayer, shall find the 'little more,' and know 'how much it is.'

As to the value of evidence, the same rules obtain here as everywhere. We have had wild and exaggerated testimonies, without discipline

and without intelligence. The mind that lacks balance and control is sure to be exuberant and to give forth more smoke than burning or illumination, when it is deeply moved and has its wonders. How can it be otherwise? But even these are not without their value. Evidently there is some generous stimulant behind it all, some spark at the heart of the turbulent clouds tossed from the fuel. If we leave them in their untamed audacity, it is not because they are to be despised. We should rather be grateful that this experience and this power is not a monopoly of the schools, that it is frankly human, that God gives with a splendid disregard of all things but vitality. The world is a world in process of discipline, and wayfaring men and foolish ones have yet their rights in the eternal, their claims to pity, to help, and to benedictions, though all may be rankly misjudged. But when thoughtful men must needs put these cases quietly apart, there remains enough for all our powers of investigation, for all our reasonable desire of evidence. Have we not all known quiet and sober people who could find no way of life but this one way of living by things for which they asked? There was nothing they could win, nothing that man gives or procures that could equip them for the tasks that had to be done daily. They prayed very simply, and very surely the necessary things came home to them and prevailed. Their prayer was not an agony, it was rather a kind of piety; it was not a fierce struggle, but an habitual repose; not a crisis, but a dying daily, out of self-will and self-desire; and behold, always they did live. The best evidences are always hidden deep; and these conquering spirits do not come into the open with banners. They are doing the will of God with content, and wishing for nothing else but to go on doing God's will in peace. In the presence of doubt and inquiry there is something of the reticence and shrinking of their Master. As He, after His resurrection, they can only show themselves to chosen witnesses, and even then they do not show *themselves*. They are worth all the arguments, all the theories, all the demonstrations that ever have been, or ever shall be—and a great deal more. If any man could see them as they are, he would steal away, softly, saying he had had a vision of angels—*any* man would say this, so long as his manhood remained. They are there: but they are not to be produced in the face of the world; not because

the world is not worthy, but because the beauty of the morning and the solemnity of the evening are both impossible in the light of common day.

It is in these characters that the strength of the argument from experience lies. Prayer is but one function of the spiritual life, and it is not to be taken apart from the totality of the character of the Christian. No man can specialize in prayer and leave the other aspects of life in Christ to be as they may be, or not to be at all. The power of prayer is the power of the whole man and all his history; and never is it so strong as when it rises in its strength through deeps and over heights, every one of which is the tabernacle of the Spirit of God. But there are crises. Now it is beyond controversy that the general view of prayer is fashioned too much on its capacity for a crisis. Prayer is regarded as a good thing for an emergency. This is not Christ's way of regarding it; and, moreover, it is not the rational way of regarding it. Such a view is founded on mean thoughts of God, on mean estimates of life, and on the meanest of all estimates of man. If the test of the crisis is to be the test of prayer, then any fair consideration of a proper test must take account of the man in whose history the crisis supervenes—what manner of man is he? How does he know to handle his plea? Is he a master in the holy art, or only a stranger and an alien, an encroacher on the prerogatives of the kingdom? To the man who lives by prayer the crises of life are apt to be few. When they do come, he has small conception of any possible tragedy. He knows whom he has believed, and is persuaded that He is able to keep. The more a man is conscious of crises and breaks, the less is his habit and power of trust. When all this is borne in mind, the less we shall be disposed to look for our evidence in single instances and in the possibility of sudden Divine intervention. But this is not to deny the possibility of sudden Divine interventions; it is not to say that there is no necessity for them, or that they are not to be expected by the man who would have all his paths ordered of the Lord, even when he falters in his desire, or is wayward in his impulses. If it were within the scope of this paper to give instances, many lie to hand, instances in which this poor man cried, and the Lord heard him and delivered him. But when a beginning is made with instances, the result is interminable. Let any unbiassed reader take up the biographies of the saints

and examine for himself, and he will find a new testimony equal in every way to that of ancient days; men and women who, through prayer, subdued kingdoms, wrought righteousness, obtained promises, stopped the mouths of lions, quenched the power of fire, escaped the edge of the sword, from weakness were made strong, waxed mighty in war, turned to flight armies of aliens. So desperate and so urgent and sudden was the need that there was nothing for it but a 'cry'—just the leaping out of all the man in one wild appeal—nothing for it, nothing possible but that, and *that* was not in vain. Whilst they were yet calling, the answer shone. But here is not the strength. Such interventions are dramatic; they appeal with most power and poignancy to the common intelligence, but they do not show the power of prayer in all its splendour and richness. If you want to know the glory and the strength of the firmament of waters you must not look to the sudden plunge of rain, but to 'the multitudinous seas.'

When we consider the characters of these men who affirm the Divine help, when we realize their simplicity and purity, their lover-like loyalty to truth, their humility, their daily service, their awe of God, their distrust of themselves, their wonder before the mystery, their great tenderness of heart, and their boundless anxiety to guide their brethren into the ways of peace, is there not much credulity in putting them lightly aside, as deceived and deceivers? If these men be false witnesses, where shall we turn for the true? Surely humility and patience and some degree of submission is only seemly, some spring of hope and gladness is only rational, some gentle and tender entreaty that we too may come into the blessed secret of their great faith, though 'passion on passion deeply is redoubled.'

But it is undoubtedly true that we must be prepared with something more than authority, even though the authority be the authority of experience. It is not enough to say that men have found it so, and then to close the windows and refuse those who look out for light rather than testimony, for a line along which the intelligence can move rather than solemn assertion. Unless we can say at least a little about the method, the fact will always miss of something that satisfies and inspires. Now, in our time, we are coming to see, as perhaps never before, that every will is a cause. Our philosophers are finding the original conception of a

cause in the action of the will. It is not simply in the observation of sequence, and the following of the effect, invariably, upon the same previous conditions, but in the individual sense of the power to originate motion, to produce change, that the original conception of causation takes its rise. We believe in causation because we know ourselves to have the power to initiate. Such phenomena as tend to the belief in the freedom of the will, owes itself to the will's capacity to interfere and modify. The very idea of will lodges in this power. If we are right in thinking of the will as a cause, is it not possible, in this direction, to find an opening along which our minds may travel, in trying to discover a little of the rationale of prayer?

It is plain that it has pleased God to limit Himself in and by His creation of this universe. It has pleased Him to give life and power and opportunity to other free agents than Himself. An intelligence that is driven is dealt with as an intelligence no longer. An intelligence can no more be compelled than sunbeams can be scalded. A will that does not voluntarily follow cannot be brought to heel, as a dog. It must either be allowed to stray or be destroyed. Warmth of heart and deep emotion only come when the mind sees, and the will yields up the whole man to the dominance of terror or beauty. However we regard ourselves, it is plain that there are some things that the Deity cannot do without our co-operation. The universe is His and ours. He has been pleased to share the dominion. Full as it is of riches and joy, neither the riches nor the joy come to us unless we put out our hand and take; and what is more to the point, God has so made us that even He cannot give them to us, unless we put out our hand and take. The higher we go in the scale of possessions, the stronger and the more discerning must we be, if we are to take hold and have. Heavenly wisdom waits, helpless, until earthly folly has been to school. One form of the Divine self-expression, then, must be recognized in the Divine self-limitation. If Personality be the wonder of the universe, the wonder of that wonder surely is that something went out of God that must tarry for man, when He said, Let us make man in our own image. But this self-limitation of the Deity *is* a form of self-expression—a very gracious form, a form that is the fountain of all grace. That God could so limit Himself is the surest of all evidences of His

calm strength; that He was not dismayed by the possibilities wrapped up in the dower of creatures such as we are is the sign and expression of His magnanimity, that God is greater than our hearts.

Now, is not prayer the return to God of that power which went from Him at our creation? God is no longer the sum of the forces of the universe. When we talk of His almightiness, we need carefully to guard our words, and still more carefully to be clear in our ideas. Is it not becoming plainer, every day, that the intellectual exigencies of our time demand that we should lay less stress upon the Divine Omnipotence and more upon the Divine Omniscience? We may be so fond of the ancient and familiar conception of omnipotence—of power, at His will, to do anything—that we are found bearing most grievous false witness, and putting burdens upon the unsophisticated that they are entirely unable to bear. Let it be repeated—God is no longer the personal sum of all the forces of the universe. He has created creatures in His own image and likeness. In some small way, but effectually enough, these creatures can defy their maker to His face, can stand up against the very thunder of His power and still abide His coming. We must not shrink from this. It is the ground and cause of human freedom, in the matter of its own destiny; it is there that we find the vindication of the awful necessity of what the Scriptures call hell. We have a gift—an awful gift. When we come with our prayers and put all at His feet, we return that gift; and now God can work His gracious will. The force that is in our will has brought itself back to the depleted centre, and all things are possible. Is not our return, our prayer, our free energy of will linking itself to God, and becoming one with Him, a new Divine opportunity, a reinforcement of His possibilities, an enlarging of His sphere? Under such conditions is it not possible for us to conceive that, when we pray and vehemently desire, God can do things for us not possible to be done under other conditions?

It is a striking fact that the Scriptures always give most power with God to those who are in sympathy with God. It is not merely that being in sympathy with the Divine purposes they most readily acquiesce, that they have lost their will in the Divine will. It is much more significant than that. It would appear that when a man has a simple kinship of will and hope with the Divine, then God will respect that man's will, will consider

and, one might almost say, consult. Perhaps the most significant instance is found in the life of Abraham. Of the Patriarch it was said—‘I have known him, to the end that he may command his children and household after him, that they may keep the way of the Lord to do justice and judgment.’ And when the Lord would arise in judgment upon the men of Sodom, because of these things—‘The Lord said, shall I hide from Abraham that which I do?’ When the purpose was unveiled, and the doom was made known to the faithful follower, ‘Abraham drew near and said, Wilt thou consume the righteous with the wicked?’ That prayer offered over the sorry cities by the brave friend of God has a world of meaning; but amid its riches does not this pearl of truth shine with a quiet power all its own—the man of God has, somehow, a power with God, and without his assent God will not arise to judgment. We may say what we will of the record as it has come down to us, and we may explain away the character and history of Abraham, but this ethical fact remains, that it has never been the wisdom of God to outrage the moral sense of those who were close and special in their fellowship with Him. Whether this story stands for that or not, we can see that to shock, to do violence and wrong to such moral perceptions as have been matured in any mind through communion with Himself, would be for God to defeat His own purposes. Abraham must be carried with Him or the judgment cannot go forth. More precious than judgment upon many sinners is the confidence and faith of one man who has talked with God face to face. Here Divine righteousness waits upon the enlightenment of one seeking soul; here Divine government will take no retributive action until the confident faith of the follower has argued the matter out with God, and, tremulous at its own hardihood, has at last in sorrow to acquiesce, sure that the Judge of all the earth will do right. At first it appears a strange scene, a childish conception of the relations between the Creator and the creature; but as we ponder the laws of moral progress, as we see the necessities of human education, the story reads with a new and touching beauty, as full of wisdom as it is of tenderness. God cannot go forward with the race unless He carries the race with Him. His power and glory wait upon our poor intelligence, upon the deep and mature assent of our instructed will.

The bearing of this upon the exposition of the place of prayer in the universe, it is not necessary to draw out at any length. If we do not see so striking instances of this principle in the New Testament, it is because there the Light and Truth have clearly shone, have so clearly shone that men of right mind, men who have been in communion with the eternal, can only say—Thou art the King of Glory, O Christ. It is likely that in the elementary beginnings of the Divine revelation there will be more serious clash, that at such a stage there will be more frequent and dramatic conflict, than at a following period, when men have followed ‘the gleam’ through long generations and learned the way of the Spirit. But we may see something of the same necessary law of Divine self-expression, even in the life of Christ. Mankind was ready for the revelation of love as the supreme law of conduct; and though it appeared, perhaps, a trifle adventurous, this new law, even to the purest souls, just a little wild in its heavenly innocence, yet the heart felt the glory of it, knew it was of God. The difficulty was not a difficulty of spiritual assent, it was a difficulty of the price that had to be paid for the pearl. About the treasure there was no doubt, about the cost of it there was, here and there, a pardonable hesitancy. When it came, however, to the central act of the life of Jesus, there was the same tragic possibility as had to be met in the life of Abraham. Abraham stood in horror before the judgment of sin upon the plain and its cities: the twelve stood in horror of the judgment of sin as it flamed, in the most lurid light of all, upon the hill called Calvary. And as Jesus prepares His followers for the appalling manifestation, may we not see something of the delicacy and tenderness, something of the withholding and the leading that marked the Divine dealing with Abraham, hard by the oaks of Mamre? Let any reader consider the moments at which Jesus introduces the tragic possibility; let him mark the deliberate choice of occasions when their enthusiasm was at the highest; let him see how, after the first vague hint, the prophecy becomes more definite, is expanded with new detail; let him consider the eager scrutiny of Jesus as he would read their very hearts on this matter; and, above all, let due weight be given to the fact that, when the Lord is quite sure that He holds them deeply enough and surely enough for their faith and hope to survive the catastrophe,

then He goes forward with a joyous abandon, with an almost reckless disregard of consequences, rejoicing as a strong man to run a race, as an appointed conscious victim, yet glorying in His adorning for the sacrifice. He tarried; He withdrew Himself; He hid; He made journeys, and put all the enmity to confusion, until His work upon the twelve was complete, until they were sure to find the horror transfigured; then He steadfastly set His face to go up to Jerusalem. It was the same law—God is bound until we have some freedom of His vast purpose. In His grace He will save us, but the grace must wait for our acceptance. There is something in us that can limit and confine the Deity, and our praying spirit, with all that prayer involves of communion and aspiration, sets God free, joins us to Him, and Him to us, so that in this holy exercise the schism of the universe passes away, and in the possibilities of the newly emerged unity, God can move as He was not able heretofore.

In this view of the operation of prayer we find the reconciliation of the conflicting theories. It is sometimes said that the only opportunity and effectual working of the praying spirit is that, in its exercises, it subdues itself to God; by the Divine Communion the human desire is chastened and purified until it ceases to become desire for any particular thing, and resolves itself into a worshipful acquiescence in the Heavenly Father's purpose. When this stage is attained, prayer is answered in the only way possible—particular desire is extinguished in worship. On the other hand, it is affirmed that prayer is nothing, unless the thing asked for is received. Unless it does something, outside the heart that prays, unless it moves God to intervention, it is not prayer, as the common heart understands and practises prayer. Then the instinct of intercession is only a false lure, leading us in a direction that may be good for us, but in which we do not want to go. The one theory affirms that prayer only changes us, is only answered by recoil; the other affirms, boldly, that prayer changes God, and is as directly answered as when a child asks for bread, and bread is lovingly given. It generally happens that when two crisp philosophies stand one over against the other, the flower of truth is found in the valley that lies between. Either hill is too dry and hard and sunless for the blossoming there. Probably it is so in this case. Anyhow, the view taken in this paper excludes

neither point, if the point be not made too aggressively sharp. It is beyond doubt that the praying man finds his vehemence chastened, that, if there is a long wrestle, more and more the heart settles into repose, comes to trust in the loving Father's care. In the sudden fiery dart, in the passionate cry of a momentary need, this is hardly possible. Neither is it true that a prayer that has to be urged through many days, and, it may be, through many years, inevitably loses its identity and persistence. It may be chastened, but it is not always cast down. Through long periods and in the growth of the person the prayer grows, strengthening with his strength and deepening with his depth, daily and hourly gaining fresh accessions of power, if also it is, at the same time, purified so as by fire. But the repose and the settling do not extinguish the desire; they may shed away some of the fringes and the insatiable hunger we seem to have for dramatic accompaniments; but the prayer still rises, like a fountain, night and day; and still the body of it is resolute after the fulfilment, unwavering and passionate in its glow. So much sanctifying always happens in prayer. But when this has happened, and still the will throbs and wrestles; being delivered from all the mere carnal concomitants, still the will streams forth to heaven and cries aloud, now entirely on the line of Divine purpose of sanctifying and service,—God is liberated. It is a bold word; but does not the word stand for actual things? Do we not shut out the Deity daily, keep Him from coming where He would? Yes, God is liberated. We are now on His lines, willing strongly at His side; and He can go forth with us and for us, doing things not for His own glory only, but for our deliverance and for the deliverance of all that are oppressed. So that it is not necessary to say that there can be no intervention; rather, it is true that prayer produces the opportunity for intervention. We have not changed God's mind, by our prayer, neither have we changed His will, but we have produced the element in which He can achieve; we have so altered the human conditions that the barriers are down and the eternal love can enter in and enrich and comfort and espouse. The barriers are down. God has helped us to cast them down as we have come near to Him in prayer, helped by His purifying of desire and hope. But our rising spirit, our will, throbbing one with His, has helped also.

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF THE PSALMS.

PSALM XC. 12.

So teach us to number our days,
That we may get us an heart of wisdom.

'This psalm,' says Isaac Taylor, 'may be cited as perhaps the most sublime of human compositions, the deepest in feeling, the loftiest in theological conception, the most magnificent in its imagery.' Its deep, sombre music has been made familiar to us by bereavement and grief. The first part contemplates the awful eternity of God and the pathetic frailty of man. The second part is a prayer for compassion, for the transfiguration of sorrow and for the prosperity which attends the Divine favour and grace.

The twelfth verse is the key-note of the 90th Psalm. It numbers sadly the days and vicissitudes of human life; but it does this, not for the sake of mere sentiment, but rather for practical purposes, that it may furnish a motive for a wiser life of the heart.

On his return from the Rockies in 1879 Professor Henry Drummond found himself at Boston, and in a curious dilemma. He had only five days before his departure for home. He was in the city of Lowell, Longfellow, Emerson, Channing, and Holmes, and he had an invitation to meet Longfellow and Holmes at dinner. But some eight hundred miles off, away by Lake Erie, there were two men, more to him than philosopher or poet—Mr. Moody and Mr. Sankey. It was hard for him to give up Longfellow, but, convinced that the world needed preachers more than poets, he set off at once. He arrived. There, before him were the two men—Mr. Sankey, down to the faultless set of his black neck-tie; Mr. Moody, to the chronic crush of his collar. Probably never in all his life did he feel a greater wrench than this from Boston; probably never greater happiness than when he burst in uninvited, unannounced upon the astonished evangelists at Cleveland. 'And yet—and yet O Henry! why didn't you dine with Longfellow and Holmes?' asks his scholarly biographer.¹ Drummond's reply must have been, 'Because it is better for most of us to spend a day with two great preachers than with two great poets.' Who shall say that the charming master of students was wrong?

I.

1. *Our Days.* The Psalmist does not speak of years, not even of months or weeks, but of days. There is something very impressive in such a mode

of reckoning. A year is a long period; and while we may hope for years of life, be they many or few, the passage of time is not continuously felt by us. But days—how they rush past and are gone, with a rapidity which on reflexion is almost appalling. Even the heedless must feel the ebb of life when it comes to be calculated by days.

We cannot profitably deal with life in the wholesale, we must deal with it in the retail. That is the way God gives us time, moment by moment; just as He gives the gold, grain by grain. We are able to handle life only in short periods. A year! No man is equal to a year, A month! No man is equal to a month. A day! That is the longest period any man can handle. Let a man finish up a day well, and he does magnificently. The best works are those which are finished particle by particle, each particle being wrought up to the highest state of perfection. Besides this there is another consideration. If time is to be spoiled, it is better to spoil only a day than to spoil a month, or to spoil a year.

God does not give life in years, but in days. Have you thought how beautiful and kind it is of our Father when He gives us time that He breaks off a bit of eternity, and says, 'There is a day; take care of it, and to-morrow come and get another?' It is just as much as we can manage. One of my children says to me, 'Father, give me a sovereign.' 'A sovereign, I daresay,—here is a penny for you! I give you as much as you can take care of.'²

Each day, each week, each month, each year is a new chance given you by God. A new chance, a new leaf, a new life—this is the golden, the unspeakable gift which each new day offers you.³

An artist recently took at short intervals a hundred photographs marking the various stages of a rapidly growing plant. Now, it would require a fine eye to distinguish progress in the successive pictures of the long series; so imperceptible would be the changes of the plant, that any two closely following plates would be indistinguishable, and *progress would be evident only when somewhat distant pictures of the series were compared.* Yet personally we often lose heart by comparing our present selves with our moral and spiritual history of yesterday. How impossible to gauge moral movement! But even when onward and upward movement is really slender, *has not modern thought recognized the immense importance of even the most trifling variation?* If we are living rightly, the deepest changes are being silently wrought

¹ G. A. Smith, *Life of Henry Drummond*, 127.

² Mark Guy Pearse.

³ Dean Farrar.

in the depths of our nature, and the faintest of these is a cause for infinite gratitude. The plant was steadily on its way to the consummation of its glorious flower, even when the photographic film failed to register its too delicate progress; and with true men the soul grows in the power of holiness, even when crude self-examinations fail to discover the delightful transformation. *No impatience will accelerate the unfolding of flower or soul; it can only retard.*¹

2. *Numbering our Days.* Perhaps it would not be difficult to number our days if we saw things as God sees. If we could reach to the end of a life, and count its years, would it take us long to number the days? Five-and-twenty thousand is not an extraordinary sum. A man with five-and-twenty thousand pounds of capital is scarcely reckoned rich. An army of five-and-twenty thousand soldiers would not be worth much in a modern war. And yet there are less than twenty-five thousand six hundred days in a lifetime of threescore years and ten. Deduct the age of infancy and the age of decrepitude, take away the months of sickness and of enforced inactivity, and there remains a number which is certainly not inestimable by reason of its magnitude.

It is especially in the spring-time of life that we do well to count our days. I don't for a moment say that we shall be excused if we are negligent about them at any other period. But this I do say, that we can least afford to waste that part of life when our minds and hearts are young, and everything we sow in them is likely to take root and flourish. Have you ever heard of the unfortunate nobleman of whom it was said that he used to lose half an hour every morning of his life, and spent the rest of the day looking for it? Even more to be pitied are the people who have lost or wasted the morning of their life, and have to struggle during the rest of their existence to make up for it.²

(1) We number our days when we feel their fewness. To the imagination of the young, life seems long. They catch no echo of 'the roar of the waves of eternity as they dash on the shores of time,'—so far away those shores appear to lie. But the further we advance the more swiftly and imperceptibly the hours and weeks and years steal on. At the outset of the voyage we mark our progress by the objects on the river-banks: trees, houses, church-spires, towering hills. But later, we have left the channel, and are on the trackless sea; and nothing indicates how remorselessly the miles accomplish themselves. Before we look for it, we shall hear the cry, 'Land ahead!' and our voyage will be finished and past.

¹ W. L. Watkinson, *The Ashes of Roses*, p. 31.

² S. Singer, *Sermons to Children*, 116.

Eternity! Eternity!

How long art thou, Eternity!

And yet to thee Time hastes away,

Like as the warhorse to the fray,

Or swift as couriers homeward go,

Or ship to port, or shaft from bow,

Ponder, O man, Eternity!³

(2) We number our days when we recall their uncertainty. Often they are abruptly broken, before they have attained their bound. 'Lord, spare the green, and take the ripe,' a lion-hearted man cried once as he entered the fight in which he fell; but the cry is not always answered, and the child as well as the parent is laid in the churchyard grave. And mental activity is no guarantee of continuance; God strikes His silence through our thoughts, our schemes, our enterprises. An unreadiness for the stupendous change of death—is it not a broken staff on which to lean? Let us remember how brittle our years are; and let us seize hold in them upon the things which cannot be shaken.

(3) We number our days, too, if we compare them with the abidingness of God. The world is old. It watches the generations come and go. The Talking Oak was thriving before King Harry turned the monks adrift; it heard the Roundhead hum his surly hymn; and still it blossomed with each returning spring. But God is both older and younger than the world. He is without beginning, and the millenniums have left Him unhurt by the tooth of time. How paltry our fourscore winters seem, in the light of His unending ages! Yes! but let us turn to Him. Let us cast ourselves on the Everlasting Arms. And the enduringness of our God will pass into our frailty and littleness.

(4) And we number our days, if we think of them in relation to the limitless future. In one sense, we are easily robbed of them; in another sense, they will come to no conclusion at all. Short as they are, they prelude an existence unimaginable, stable, deathless. Now we are laying the foundations of a palace or of a prison, from which we shall go no more out. Now we are moulding for ourselves a king's unfading crown or a captive's inexorable chain. And since momentous issues hang on the slender thread of our fleeting days, let us seek and find Christ's pardon, let us live as one about to migrate, and let us be diligent in our Father's business.⁴

³ *Lyra Germanica*, 26.

⁴ A. Smellie, *In the Secret Place*.

II.

But the text is especially concerned with a certain motive we should have for numbering our days—'So number your days.' The motive is that we may obtain a heart of wisdom.

1. The first thing, then, in the numbering of our days is to see that we have *the right end* in view—this end, 'that we may get us a heart of wisdom.' Now it is needful to remember that we must give a much wider interpretation to the word 'heart' than is accorded to it in modern usage. Nowadays it has been degraded until it suggests and comprehends the emotional life only. But to express the Old Testament meaning we must add the factors of the mind and will. It is a masculine word, describing the allied forces of the inner life. And the Psalmist's purpose is that the whole of this spiritual army should be possessed and illumined by 'wisdom.' It is needful, again, to remember that 'wisdom' is more than knowledge. It is the supreme light of the Divine, the irradiation which springs from intimate and constant Fellowship with God. And therefore the prayer of the Psalmist expresses a pleading for a holy light which shall illumine mind and heart and will, and so transfigure the life in its character and conduct.

(1) Wisdom is not money. What is material wealth—houses, ships, lands, money—compared with the high and lofty characteristics of mind when it has been adequately instructed, or those treasures of thought, feeling, and impulse which accumulate in the high ranges of spiritual reception and expression? It is a short-sighted vision which plans only for the triumphs which the skill and strength of man can gain over matter. It is a mean ambition that is contented with the accumulation of material fortune. Try as much as you please, you cannot lift the mercenary motive to the level of dignity and applause. Men do not applaud it. There is too much of the divinity of correct judgment in them to pronounce mercenary results, however large, worthy of man or an ornament to society.

(2) Nor is wisdom pleasure. This is not to say that happiness may never be hoped for, or enjoyed when it comes. If we did not desire to be happy, we should be more than human,—or less. But the only way of obtaining happiness is to renounce altogether the pursuit of it. 'Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness;

and all these things'—things which go to make life happy—'shall be added unto you.'

2. But if the true end is to be reached there must be a *right starting-point*. Everything depends on the start in the religious life. It is said, 'All is well that ends well.' That is a lie. The penitent thief ended well, but that did not undo the mischief of his life. It did not restore the stolen goods, or banish the misery from the broken-hearted mothers of those he had slain. It does not do to begin at the wrong end. 'Well begun is half done.' That is true. The old rhyme says of the day, 'Between six and eight, you have sealed its fate.' You have made your day between six and eight. Sailors can see by the sunrise what the character of the day is to be. If you get a good sunrise, you will get a good day. And you can make your own sunrise in religion.

The quaint Fuller tells us of a Sybil offering to sell to a King of Rome three volumes of her oracles, but he refused to buy because of the high price. She took them away and burned one volume, and afterwards returned to sell the two remaining at the price of three. He refused again, thinking her little better than frantic: thereupon she burned the second volume, and demanded the same price for the remaining one that she had asked for the three. Otherwise she would burn that also, and he would dearly repent it. The king, thinking it must be of great value and admiring her resolution, bought it. There are three volumes of men's time: Youth, Manhood, and Old Age; and ministers advise them to redeem this time. But men think the price too much, because it will cost them the renouncing of carnal delights. Whereupon one-third part of their life (youth) is consumed. The same renunciation, or price, is asked for manhood, but refused; so of old age, the last volume, and the same price; but the aged will find it harder and dearer, because of fixed habits, than if they had bought all three at the beginning.

There is a very striking utterance of Coleridge, in which he says that 'There is no chance of truth as the goal where there is not a childlike humility at the starting-point.' I suppose that Carlyle would substitute the word 'reverence' in place of the word 'humility.' The Bible uses neither word, but employs the mighty phrase, 'the fear of the Lord.' It is here that we are to find 'the beginning of wisdom.' When a man wishes to make a sacred and worthy use of time he must lay aside all flippancy and insincerity, and move in the spirit of holy reverence and fear.¹

3. There must also be serious *determination to make progress*. A man who wants to employ every moment in dignified purpose must be continually questioning the moral significance of things. He must not allow things to 'take their chance.' He must assert an imperative *discrimination* over every-

¹ J. H. Jowett.

thing that comes to his door. He must not pay final homage to established custom. There are some customs which he must break if he would preserve his own integrity. Neither must he allow his feelings to decide his destiny. It is not what he likes that must be the arbiter, but what is morally true. He must bring everything to the bar of moral judgment. He must cross-examine everything. 'Where are you going? What is your main trend? Are you a regular liner or only a buccaneer on the high seas?'

There are two ways in which days may be numbered to no purpose.

(1) That of the Epicurean—'Let us eat and drink; for tomorrow we die.' There is a strong tendency to reckless enjoyment when the time is felt to be short, and religion does not exist to restrain.

(2) That of the sentimentalist. It is no part of our Christian duty to think of decay in an abject spirit. That which the demoniac in the Gospels did, having his dwelling among the tombs, has sometimes been reckoned the perfection of Christian unworldliness. Men have looked on every joy as a temptation; on every earnest pursuit as a snare—the skull and the hour-glass their companions, curtaining life with melancholy, haunting it with visions and emblems of mortality. This is not Christianity. Rather it is so to dwell on thoughts of death 'that we may apply our hearts unto wisdom.' If the history of these solemn truths does not stimulate us to duty and action, it were no duty to remind ourselves of them. Rather the reverse. Better shut out such gloomy and useless thoughts. But there is a way of dwelling amidst these facts which solemnizes life instead of paralyzing it. He is best prepared to meet change who sees it at a distance and contemplates it calmly.¹

4. Again, there must be a *dynamic*. If we are to set about in quest of a noble and transfigured character, to press on 'toward the mark of the high calling of God in Christ' we need an adequate inspiration. And here it is: 'I can do all things in Christ strengthening me.' And here it is again: it is possible for me to apprehend that 'for which also I have been apprehended of Christ.' 'Thou, O Christ, art all I want.' If we will consecrate our judgments and our wills, and use the common sense which is the Lord's finest gift next to His own grace, He will bestow upon us the powers of the Spirit, and we shall find that the impossible is our destined inheritance.

The dynamic is the love of God in Christ Jesus. It is the conviction that God loves us, and loves us with all the love He has got. If I had to make God love me I should give up in despair, for I should never be loved. Said one of my

little ones to the youngest, in that threatening tone which is usually adopted in teaching, 'You must be good, you know, or father wont love you.' Then I called him to myself, and said, gravely and tenderly, 'Do you know what you have said? It is not true, my boy, not a bit true; you never made a bigger mistake, my son. I don't love you because you are good. There are lots of lads, but I love you just because you are my own little son. If you grow up to be the worst man I shall love you with a love that will break my heart, but I shall love you still. I don't love you only when you are good. I love you because I cannot help loving you. When you are good I love you with a love that makes me glad, and when you are not good I love you with a love that makes me sad.' 'Is that it?' said my child. 'Then I will be good, father.' God's love is not conditioned. Nothing we can ever do, nothing we can ever be, nothing we can ever feel or believe, will make God love us more than He does.²

5. And, finally, there must be *some method*. The great majority of people are convinced that they have little or no time for anything. One of the commonest wastes of time is that which consists in frequently saying that we have no time at all. It is a commonplace that it is the busiest man who is always readiest to do a little more. In the simple matter of packing a bag it is amazing how soon the inexpert packer seems to be at the end of his resources. But the expert packer of a bag always has room for another article. And so it is in the daily life. Methodical men, with purpose and method, can always find a corner for a good thing. Morley's *Life of Gladstone* revealed to us how marvellous were the harvestings which that great man made in the mere corners of his fields.

Like all the greatest spiritual poetry, this Psalm has a deep undertone of remorse and retribution. Rossetti's terrible sonnet, which he entitled 'Lost Days,' reads like a commentary on 'Thou hast set our iniquities before thee: our secret sins in the light of thy countenance.'

The lost days of my life until to-day,

What were they, could I see them on the street

Lie as they fell? Would they be ears of wheat

Sown once for food but trodden into clay?

Or golden coins squandered and still to pay?

Or drops of blood dabbling the guilty feet?

Or such spilt water as in dreams must cheat

The undying throats of Hell, athirst alway?

I do not see them here; but after death

God knows I know the faces I shall see,
Each one a murdered self, with low last breath.

'I am thyself,—what hast thou done to me?'

'And I—and I—thyself' (lo! each one saith),

'And thou thyself to all eternity!'

¹ F. W. Robertson.

² Mark Guy Pearse.

A Mirror for Rulers.

By THE REV. S. R. DRIVER, D.D., REGIUS PROFESSOR OF HEBREW IN THE
UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.¹

'Give the king thy judgements, O God, and thy righteousness to the king's son.'—Ps 72¹.

THESE familiar words form the opening verse of a Psalm which depicts the ideal of a godly king. Who the king was with regard to whom the words were spoken, we do not know: it was pretty clearly one of the later kings—possibly Josiah. The Psalm reads as though it were written at the time of the king's accession; and the poet prays that God will confer upon him the gifts that will enable him to fulfil the ideal of his office, and to prove himself a beneficent and righteous ruler.

Give the king thy judgements, O God,

And thy righteousness to the king's son.

May God give the king a store of His judgements, or decisions, that he may appropriate and apply them, when cases come before him for judgement; and may He endow him, as the son of a royal father, with a divine sense of justice that may make him a worthy ruler. May he, the poet continues, judge God's people with righteousness, and His poor—those common victims of oppression and injustice under an Oriental government—with judgement; may peace and righteousness flourish in his land; may his rule be as gentle and beneficent, as the rain coming down upon the mown grass, and as drops that water the earth!

Next, taking a bolder flight, the poet prays that his realm may be wider than Solomon's, that all enemies may be subdued before him, and that the most distant and famous peoples may do him homage—

May he have dominion also from sea to sea,

And from the Euphrates to the ends of the earth!

May the desert-dwellers—the wild Bedawin, the free sons of the desert, who will not readily own any superior—may the desert-dwellers bow before him,

And his enemies lick the dust!

May the kings of Tarshish and of the isles—of Tartessus in distant Spain, and the isles and coasts of the Mediterranean Sea—render presents!

¹ A sermon preached in the Cathedral Church of Christ, Oxford, on the First Sunday after Trinity (June 18), 1911.

May the kings of Sheba—in South Arabia, and Seba—in Abyssinia—bring dues!

Yea, may all kings fall down before him,

May all nations do him service!

The vision of a world-wide dominion, and of a world-wide homage, rises here in the poet's mind; but the king's claim to it rests upon the justice and mercifulness of his rule. As before, his special merit is his care for the poor and the oppressed—

For he will deliver the needy when he crieth;

The poor also, and him that hath no helper;

He will have pity on the feeble and the needy,

And the lives of the needy he will save;

He will redeem their souls from oppression and wrong,

And precious will their blood be in his sight.

And the Psalmist closes with three final prayers, for the welfare of the king, the prosperity of his land and people, and the honourable perpetuation of his name—

So may he live! and may there be given unto him of the gold of Sheba!

May prayer also be made for him—not, as in the Prayer-Book Version, 'unto him'—continually!

And daily may he be blessed!

May there be abundance of corn in the land upon the top of the mountains;

May the fruit thereof shake like Lebanon:

And may men blossom out of the city like the herbage of the earth!

May his name endure for ever!

May his name be propagated—*i.e.* perpetuated by his descendants—as long as the sun endureth!

May men also bless themselves by him—*i.e.* use his name in blessing as a type of happiness, saying, 'God make thee like this king!'

May all nations call him happy!

Such are the prayers and splendid anticipations, which, on a gala day, were expressed by some poet of Israel on behalf of a newly anointed king of his people. The poet's thoughts move along lines suggested partly by reminiscences of the happy

reign of Solomon, partly by a sense of what the qualifications of a just ruler should be under the social conditions of the time. But the poet, in the hopes and anticipations which he puts forth, includes more than could be realized by any actual king of Israel, and portrays, in fact, an *ideal* king, whose just and perfect rule extends to the ends of the earth, and commands the homage of the world. And in so far as he does this, he looks out beyond the actual king whose accession he celebrates, and constructs a picture of the ideal king of Israel, whom we call the Messiah. But it is not on this aspect of the Psalm that I desire to dwell further to-day.

The blessings of a wise and beneficent rule are often alluded to in the Old Testament. In a poem in the Second Book of Samuel, called the 'Last words of David,' the blessings of such a rule are compared beautifully to the life-giving sunshine of a cloudless morning, when after rain the earth appears clad with fresh young verdure—

When one ruleth over men righteously,

Ruleth in the fear of God,

Then is it as the light of the morning when the sun ariseth,

A morning without clouds, when through clear shining after rain the young grass springeth out of the earth.

And the ideal king is depicted in the prophets as doing, like David and Solomon, judgement and justice in the land; as defending the cause of the poor, and delivering them from oppression and wrong; as punishing the wrong-doer, and by a wise and just rule maintaining the prosperity of his people. In the 101st Psalm we have what has been called a 'mirror for rulers.' A king speaks in it; and he solemnly professes his resolve not, like many an Eastern ruler, to make his palace the home of caprice, and self-indulgence, and corruption, and favouritism, but to walk within his house in the integrity of his heart, to set no base example before his eyes, to cherish no crooked purpose or evil design, to tolerate around him no slander or pride or injustice, but to make men of probity and integrity his companions and ministers, and finally, morning by morning, to hold his court of justice, that he may 'root out all wicked doers out of the city of the Lord.' And so this Psalm is naturally appointed as one of the Proper Psalms for the day of the sovereign's accession.

I have been led to refer this morning to these ideals of kingly rule, on account of the great national event which is to take place next Thursday. More than a year has indeed elapsed since our gracious Sovereign assumed the throne: but it is the striking and impressive Coronation ceremony which seals and ratifies his accession, and formally entrusts to him the high duties and the high responsibilities which in his august office he is called upon to perform. Circumstances have indeed changed greatly since the poets and prophets of Israel wrote. In those days absolute monarchies were the usual form of government in the East; they were indeed the only practicable form of government, in times when the culture and education of the people were limited, when what we should call the political life of a nation had not yet begun to assert itself, and the influence of the people upon such subjects as legislation, the treatment of social problems, and national policy, was practically *nil*. But an absolute monarchy is no longer suited to the wide and varied needs and interests of modern civilization: hence the monarchies which have continued to the present day are mostly limited in power, to a far greater extent than was the case in antiquity; the power of the people, as represented in parliamentary assemblies and other ways, has greatly increased; while in many nations democracies have supplanted monarchies altogether. But whether the government be a monarchy, or an oligarchy, or a democracy, all governments are constituted to maintain the welfare of the people governed by them; and hence the great principles of righteousness and equity and justice, on which the prophets so eloquently insist, and of which the Psalmists sing, remain as the foundations of a prosperous state, and as the essential conditions of its people's welfare. 'Righteousness,' says a Hebrew proverb, 'exalteth a nation; but sin is a reproach to peoples.' And all history shows the truth of this generalization, whatever be the form of government by which the nation is ruled.

It is true, of course, that the power and rights of the Crown being in modern countries limited, and the population and area of a country like our own, for instance, being so much greater than those of ancient Israel, the sovereign cannot interfere directly, or act personally, to the extent that he did there; he cannot, for instance, like David and Solomon, himself administer justice, or himself

introduce reforms, or determine, with merely the approval of a few counsellors, questions of peace and war: but he can do a great deal indirectly; he can, in virtue of his high position, and the respect which it commands, influence public opinion, and contribute materially to maintain high standards of responsibility and honour on the part of his ministers; he can mark with his approval men of efficiency and high character; he can, by suggestion and example, encourage and promote social reforms. Power need not be the less real, because it is wielded indirectly. Certainly, the most crying evils of an Oriental monarchy—the abuse of power and position on the part of high officials, the extortion and oppression practised by them upon the poor and the defenceless, and the selling of justice to the highest bidder—are, happily, unknown in this country, and do not therefore need a sovereign to put them down. But there are still, it must sorrowfully be confessed, many social abuses rife among the less responsible classes of the community,—among the wealthy, for instance, luxury and selfishness are more prevalent than they should be, and among the middle classes, the love of gain leads often both to impositions upon those who are least able to bear them, and to the terrible abuse commonly described as ‘sweating’: these can only be effectively rectified by moving public opinion; and in contributing towards this end, the indirect influence of the sovereign may be of supreme value. The sovereign is still the head of the State, though he acts largely not personally, but through the agency of ministers, judges, and other representatives, whose appointments are either made or sanctioned by himself. And so in the coronation ceremony, the Sword, the symbol of judgement, and of the power to maintain order, to put down misgovernment, and to punish evil-doers, is presented upon the altar with a prayer, the terms of which are suggested by words of St. Paul (Ro 13⁴), and St. Peter (1 P 2¹⁴): ‘Hear our prayers, O Lord, we beseech thee, and so direct and support thy servant, our king, who is now to be girt with this sword, that he may not bear it in vain; but may use it as the minister of God for the terror and punishment of evil-doers, and for the protection and encouragement of those that do well, through Jesus Christ

our Lord.’ And afterwards, when it has been girt about him, the sovereign is addressed in these words: ‘With this sword do justice, stop the growth of iniquity, protect the holy Church of God, help and defend widows and orphans, restore the things that are gone to decay, maintain the things that are restored, punish and reform what is amiss, and confirm what is in good order; that doing these things you may be glorious in all virtue; and so faithfully serve our Lord Jesus Christ in this life, that you may reign for ever with Him in the life which is to come.’ And the Sceptre, ‘the ensign of kingly power and justice,’ is delivered to him with these words: ‘Receive the Rod of equity and mercy: and God, from whom all holy desires, all good counsels, and all just works do proceed, direct and assist you in the administration and exercise of all those powers which he has given you. Be so merciful that you be not too remiss; so execute justice that you forget not mercy. Punish the wicked, protect and cherish the just, and lead your people in the way wherein they should go.’

These, then, are the high responsibilities which our Sovereign undertakes—to maintain effectually justice and good government, to temper wisely judgement with mercy, to have a care for true religion, to defend the unprotected, to punish evil-doers and in general to check iniquity, to correct anomalies and abuses, to guard and preserve whatever may contribute to the well-being of the people. Expanded and enlarged, these are just the same responsibilities which, in the two Psalms which I have quoted this morning, constitute the ideal of a king. Let us be thankful that we in this country are ruled by a Sovereign who, as we well know, will respect and maintain the noble traditions of high endeavour and high achievement which he has inherited from his ancestors; who will devote himself, heart and soul, to the task of realizing, as far as in him lies, the great ideal which the Coronation service sets before him; and who, with God’s help, will pass on to his successors an empire, embracing far-stretching regions in every quarter of the globe, not less stable, and not less well-ordered, and well-governed, than it was when he received it from his beloved and honoured father.

Fresh Light on the Jewish Calendar.

By P. S. P. HANDCOCK, B.A., BRITISH MUSEUM.

THE Aramaic papyri from the Jewish colony at Assuan-Elephantine, recently published by Professor Sayce and Dr. Cowley, have afforded a rich and ample supply of material for the study of the times to which they belong, the language in which they were written, and the people and place from which they emanated, and scholars have done justice to the additional wealth of matter thus placed at their disposal, but the value of the chronological evidence yielded by these papyri has not been appreciated to the extent which it deserves, as Dr. Sprengling shows in the article he publishes in this quarter's issue of the *American Journal of Semitic Languages*.

According to Meyer and Breasted the calendar was introduced into Egypt in 4241 B.C. It was, however, an imperfect calendar, paying no attention either to the solar year or the lunar month; but it nevertheless maintained its position there without a rival till the year 46 B.C., when it was supplanted by the Julian calendar. The early Egyptian calendrical year contained 365 days, and as no leap-year was introduced to rectify the annual lapse of about a quarter of a day, the calendrical year gained a day on the solar year every four years; thus, in a period of 4×365 years, *i.e.* 1460 years, the Egyptian year had gained one whole year over the Solar or Julian year (the Julian year containing $365\frac{1}{4}$ days, and beginning on January 14th). Accordingly any date in the old Egyptian calendar astronomically synchronized with a date in the Julian, would enable one to determine the relationship existing between the two on any given date, by a process of reckoning backwards or forwards as the case may be. Fortunately we are in possession of several such dates, thanks to which we know definitely that during the period of sixty-seven years (473-406 B.C.) covered by the Aramaic papyri from Elephantine, the beginning of the Egyptian year lapsed from December 19th to December 3rd—*i.e.* Thoth 1 = December 19th from 473-470 (quarter days not counting yearly but being allowed to accumulate till the fourth year, when the solar year is readjusted by the addition of a full day); Thoth 1 = December 18th from 469-466, and so on. And it is at this point,

as Dr. Sprengling shows, that the importance of the chronological data afforded by the Elephantine papyri becomes manifest. For the period in question, they give us a number of dates according to the Jewish calendar together with their precise equivalents in the Egyptian calendar. The Jewish manner of reckoning was not so conventional, and consequently not so easily determinable, as that of the Egyptians. In the books of the Old Testament contemporaneous with the period with which we are dealing we find mention of the months Nisan, Siwan, Elul, Kislew, Tebet, Shebat, and Adar, while the Aramaic papyri add Tishri, Marcheshwan, and Tammuz; we thus have in these two contemporaneous sources the whole list of Jewish months, with the single exception of Iyyar.

None of these months occur in any pre-exilic document, and the names of all of them appear to be simply Aramaized forms of the names found in the Assyrian-Babylonian calendar, the natural inference being that they must have come into use in Egypt, as well as in Babylonia and Palestine, about the time of the Exile. Thus much for the names of the months, but we have next to inquire into their character, and the manner in which their lengths, their beginnings and their endings were duly determined. Neither the papyri nor the Biblical documents throw much light on this question. The latter show the existence of a certain tendency to observe the various phases of the moon, and specifically the new moon—the 'hodesh' in its twofold meaning of 'month' and 'new moon'—and in a lesser degree the full moon, 'kissē.' If a selection of dates in the Julian calendar, whose corresponding position in the Egyptian calendar is also known, be taken, and a margin of uncertainty of three years be allowed in regard to the year of the king's reign mentioned in each particular case, a consultation of the table of new moons in Ginzel shows, that in the majority of cases the Jewish month began a day or so after the preceding new moon, as was also the case in Babylonia at this period, its beginning coinciding with the first observed appearance of the new moon, and consequently, though the Jewish

months were thus lunar, and based scientifically on astronomical observations, they inevitably lacked precision, for if the sky was cloudy, or any other contingency arose to obscure the face of the moon, the commencement of the month, depending as it did on observation rather than on mathematical calculation, would be materially affected, while at the same time the Jewish months were in a general way actual lunations and therefore more scientific than the purely conventional months of the Egyptian calendar.

The synodical month, the period between one actual new moon and the next, is 29 days 44 minutes 2'9 seconds, and the Jewish months alternated fairly regularly between 29 and 30 days. The actual lunar year comprises from 354-355 days, and of course the discrepancy existing between that and the solar year of 365 days, 5 hours 48 minutes 46 seconds, did not escape the notice of the Jew of Persian times, for a gain of ten days yearly would very soon convert the months of the lunar year associated with the summer season into winter months, and *vice versa*. It was therefore necessarily apparent to them that the lunar year was in reality not a year—*i.e.* a complete revolution of the earth round the sun—at all. This obvious fact was noted alike by Babylonians, Greeks, and Jews, who consequently all recognized lunar and solar years in their systems, the discrepancy between the two being adjusted by intercalating a thirteenth month periodically. The period at which these intercalations took place is somewhat uncertain, but we are in possession of clearer information concerning the time and season in which the Jewish year commenced, though this latter point has little or no bearing on the intercalation question. But the discovery of the time when the Jewish year at this period commenced is of paramount importance in regard to the conversion of the particular years of Persian kings' reigns into years B.C. Generally speaking, the Babylonians and Assyrians commenced their year about the time of the vernal equinox, the Greeks at the autumnal equinox, the Romans about the time of the winter solstice, the Egyptians at whatever season their conventionalized year happened to come to an end. The Jewish year at this time commenced with the month Nisan, as did also the Babylonian and Assyrian year, and probably the Persian year as well, the Jewish 'civil' year com-

mencing with 'Tishri' being probably a later Greek institution; the beginning of the year was without doubt kept as close as possible to the time of the vernal equinox, though this latter would obviously not be ascertained with the astronomical precision of to-day. The next question discussed by Sprengling is the method of dating adopted at this period, for the practice of dating by era does not seem to have come into use till 312-11 B.C. (*i.e.* the Seleucid era). The earliest mode of reckoning years was based on the association of each year with some striking occurrence—*e.g.* the year of the earthquake—such was the usage in Babylonia in the time of Hammurabi (*circa* 1900 B.C.). Later on, the inadequacy of such a system gave birth to the practice of naming each year after some exalted personage, in Greece after archons, ephors, strategoi, etc., in Rome after consuls, while in monarchical countries the tendency to associate each year with the second, third, or fourth year of the king's reign would be almost irresistible. It is this latter method which we find adopted in the Aramaic papyri from Elephantine, as also in the cuneiform Egibi and Murashu contract tablets of Persian times. The obvious objection to this system is that the beginning of the first year of a king's reign would only coincide with the commencement of the year at the time of the vernal equinox on the rarest possible occasions, and in dating their years the first, tenth, or twentieth year of King 'X,' the years thus dated would not be proper years commencing in Nisan. Two solutions to the problem were available, the first was to ante-date, *i.e.* to ascribe the whole year beginning from the preceding Nisan, to the king who acceded to the throne some time later in that year, calling the whole year the first year of King 'X'; the second was to post-date, *i.e.* to ascribe the whole of the year from the preceding Nisan to the king who died or, at all events, ceased to reign in that year, the 'first year' of the succeeding king only being reckoned from the first Nisan occurring in his reign. That the latter was more natural than the former is clear, for the tendency to follow habit and continue dating by the reign of the king whose name has become familiar is quite intelligible, while there can be no tendency to follow the reverse course of ante-dating. Sprengling adduces a mass of evidence to prove that the post-dating system was adopted throughout in these papyri (Xerxes-Darius II.) as was the case also in the Egibi documents, and

probably also in the Murashu tablets of Darius ; he calls attention to two interesting pieces of evidence, one contained in these papyri, and the other found in the Murashu tablets : in papyrus B the accession year of Artaxerxes I. is equated with the twenty-first year of Xerxes ; and in one of the six of the Murashu tablets, dated in the accession year of Darius II., that year is equated with Artaxerxes' forty-first year. Having established his point, Sprengling proceeds to elucidate the various chronological data in the papyri (Xerxes-Darius II.) by a universal application of the post-dating system, the nett results of which, as given by Dr. Sprengling, are briefly set forth below.

539. October, Cyrus captures Babylon.

530. July to August, Cambyses appointed king.

529 (probably). Cyrus dies in the far north-east.

525. Cambyses conquers Egypt.

523. March, Smerdis revolts ; Cambyses on the campaign against Ethiopia.
March to April, Smerdis assumes title and throne.

522. July to August, Cambyses dies.
October, Smerdis killed ; Darius assumes the crown ; Nidintubel, pretender in Babylon.

486. Darius dies. Xerxes king.
(The change of rulers probably took place late in 486.)

465. Summer, Xerxes killed ; Artaxerxes king.

424. March to April, Artaxerxes dies. Xerxes II.

May to June, Xerxes II. dies. Sogdianus.

423. January, Sogdianus killed. Darius II.

404. Winter or early spring, Darius II. dies.

Literature.

JOHN WESLEY'S JOURNAL.

If the Wesleyans themselves had not undertaken a standard edition of the *Journal*, some enterprising literary man would certainly have taken it in hand. For it was impossible that one of our greatest English classics should have remained much longer unedited in that sumptuous way in which English people love to see their classics on their shelves. Mr. Curnock's edition is as handsome as an edition could be desired to be, and it is distinctly better than the most accomplished literary man could have produced, dealing with it, as he would have done, simply as a work of literature. Birkbeck Hill gave us an edition of Boswell which we have no desire to see surpassed, and he was a literary man pure and simple. But then Boswell's Johnson is a literary work pure and simple. Let the outsider, the reader who is not a Methodist, go through but a few pages of Curnock's standard edition of *Wesley's Journal*, and he will be convinced not only that the things which are most essential to the editing of the book are not literary things at all, but also that they are of so special and intimate a character as to be utterly out of reach of the comprehension of the mere man of letters. The editor

of *Wesley's Journal* must be a man of letters ; but, more than that, he must be a religious man ; and, more than that still, he must be a Methodist.

This is the second volume of *The Journal of John Wesley*. It offers no such biographical surprise as the first volume offered ; yet the careful reader will find many matters of astonishment in it. However well acquainted with the *Journal* he may be, the things in this edition with which he is not acquainted he will find to be very many. And not only so, he will find that the new materials it provides for him will compel him to readjust his judgment on several matters of importance, and possibly even to revise his whole estimate of the character and capacity of this mighty man of God.

We were at first inclined to grudge the time it took to read the book. For the notes are numerous and the type is small, and we discovered that skipping was out of the question. But we have changed our mind about that. For it is a book of a lifetime (Kelly ; 10s. 6d. net).

PAGANISM IN SCOTLAND.

Whatever else the Education Act has done, it has done something in Scotland for religion.

Thomas Pennant, who travelled in Perthshire in the year 1769, tells us that 'on the 1st of May the herdmen of every village hold their Beltein, a rural sacrifice. They cut a square trench on the ground, leaving the turf in the middle; on that they make a fire of wood, on which they dress a large caudle of eggs, butter, oatmeal, and milk; and bring, besides the ingredients of the caudle, plenty of beer and whisky; for each of the company must contribute something. The rites began with spilling some of the caudle on the ground, by way of libation: on that, every one takes a cake of oatmeal, upon which are raised nine square knobs, each dedicated to some particular being, the supposed preserver of their flocks and herds, and to some particular animal, the real destroyer of them. Each person then turns his face to the fire, breaks off a knob, and flinging it over his shoulders, says, "This I give to thee, preserve thou my horses; this to thee, preserve thou my sheep," and so on. After that they use the same ceremony to the noxious animals: "This I give to thee, O fox! spare thou my lambs; this to thee, O hooded crow! this to thee, O eagle!" When the ceremony is over, they dine on the caudle; and after the feast is finished, what is left is hid by two persons deputed for that purpose, but on the next Sunday they reassemble and finish the reliques of the first entertainment.'

Now, all that is pure paganism, and a very considerable proportion of it continued to be practised for another century; but we do not believe that in the loneliest Perthshire glen anything of the kind, or anything approaching to it in practice, could be found to-day. In practice, we say; for among the peasantry beliefs remain long after practices are given up. But we are safe enough to conclude that, even if we could get to the back of the mind of the Celt who dwells in the remotest corner of the Highlands, we should find that the Education Act had made serious havoc of his pagan inheritance.

So the interest of Mr. George Henderson's *Survivals in Belief among the Celts* (Maclehose; 10s. net) is mainly antiquarian. But how deep the interest is, and just for that reason. No doubt it depends on the telling, and Mr. Henderson can tell his story well. Yet, what a story he has to tell. With beliefs like these, so widespread and so degrading, we cease to wonder that those who a century ago refused to give their money for

Foreign Missions used the argument that there were savages enough at home.

LOLLARDY.

We were under the impression that Dr. James Gairdner had completed his history of *Lollardy and the Reformation in England* in the two volumes which were noticed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES on their publication in 1908. And we think the author himself was under the same impression. However, here is a third volume. And it is a wonderful thing that at his time of life (he is now in his eighty-fourth year) Dr. Gairdner had the courage to pursue the subject beyond the time at which he might have let it drop. And it is still more wonderful that he has been able to write the additional volume, and see it through the press so successfully (Macmillan; 10s. 6d. net).

Dr. Gairdner does not deny that the reception of his first two volumes was not altogether flattering. And he does not deny that there was some occasion for the lack of cordiality. Indeed, he frankly owns that there was a good deal in the execution of the work requiring apology, and in issuing this third volume he has issued along with it, not only a list of errata for the two volumes, but also a number of new pages which he wishes to take the place of the corresponding pages in them.

It cannot be said, however, that in the third volume Dr. Gairdner has much more sympathy with Lollardy than he had before. And that is, after all, the most important matter. His sympathy is still quite unmistakably with the other side. But Dr. Gairdner does not write history pure and simple. He writes in the belief that the Church of Rome has had less than her due from ecclesiastical historians, and he undertook to write the history of Lollardy with the deliberate and openly avowed intention of saying all that could be said in favour of that Church. We now, therefore, know that at least we are not doing the Church of Rome injustice when we form our judgment on her moral life and spiritual influence in England before the Reformation from this book; and we think that few will hesitate to say that if this is really the best case that can be made out, the need of the reformation of religion was very great.

BOEHME.

A new edition has been published of John Sparrow's translation of *The Forty Questions* and the *Clavis* of Jacob Boehme (Watkins; ros. 6d. net). The translation follows that of 1647, the earliest of all. This translation has been read by Mrs. D. S. Hehner, who in a modest note states that the reading consisted of a close comparison of Sparrow's translations of the *Clavis* and the *Forty Questions* with the original German, the German texts used being those of 1682 and 1730. One striking fact has been brought out by this comparison. It is that the 1682 edition is more reliable than the edition of 1730, although the latter is always regarded as the standard edition. By 'reliable,' however, Mrs. Hehner seems to mean no more than closer to Boehme's method (or want of method) in spelling words. Use has also been made of the latest German edition by Schiebler, and of St. Martin's translation of the *Forty Questions* into French. Mrs. Hehner's object has been to make the translation as *accurate* as possible; for her hope is that English people may, by means of this edition, be induced to become students of Boehme.

The emendations are given partly in the margin at the outer side of the page, and partly as notes at the foot of it. There is a good example of the latter on page 84. The paragraph is as follows: 'And the water again seeketh the glass, and would have a house to dwell in, and that is flesh; as you see, the water receiveth the shadow of all bodily substances, so that the body may be seen in the water, and that is because the seeking of the water hath captivated it.'

Now, Boehme seems to have written, not 'the seeking of the water,' but 'the seeking of the fire hath captivated it.' Both the 1682 and the 1730 editions of the German have *des Feuers Sucht*, and Schiebler has reprinted the same. But Mrs. Hehner points out that St. Martin, while rendering the original literally, has stated that he considers Sparrow was right in substituting 'water' for 'fire.'

The volume has been edited throughout with much care, and the publishers have done all that publishers could do to make this edition worthy of Boehme's great name and a fit instrument for the wider study of his works.

Messrs. Appleton have published a volume, in fine clear type, on *The Training of Children in Religion* (6s. net). The author is the Rev. George Hodges, D.D., Dean of the Episcopal Theological School at Cambridge, Massachusetts.

There are two questions about training in religion. One is, What religion? The other is, How is the training to be done? It is the second question that Dr. Hodges answers. And it is unnecessary to say that he answers the question thoroughly, with scientific method, backed by ample experience. For he is an American, and the Americans have taught religion scientifically and successfully for a long time, whereas we have not begun yet.

But in teaching the method Dr. Hodges has also had to decide what religion was to be taught. He has had to say how he accepts the Bible. How does he accept it? Take this paragraph. 'When, therefore, the child asks, "Is that true?" the teacher of the Bible may answer with all frankness. If he doubts that the historian got the number right when he said that Samson with the jawbone of an ass slew a thousand men, no calamity will follow when he replies, "I think not." The truth is in the might of Samson, not in the details of his adventures. And the same principle holds when the child asks, "Was that right?" Was it right in the psalmist to desire to wash his footsteps in the blood of the ungodly, and to have the tongue of his dogs red through the same? A thousand times No. That was simply as far as they had got at that time along the road of conduct. To-day, taught as we are by wiser teachers, even by Christ Himself, we know better.'

It used to be considered necessary to say that the Bible was different in kind from all other books before it could be taught with authority; now it is enough to be able to say it is different in degree.

Out of the many volumes of Lent sermons that issue from the press, lay hands on the volume entitled *The Crown of Thorns* (Arnold; 2s. 6d. net). Its author is a scholar and a preacher, the Rev. A. E. Burn, D.D., Vicar of Halifax. While the tone is truly devotional, touched here and there with the secret we call mystical, there is a thought in every sermon for the intellect to find pleasure in. The first six sermons bring forward the people who had their part in the Betrayal,

and reveal their sin: First, 'the Sin of Judas—Hypocrisy'; last, 'the Sin of St. Peter—Cowardice.' Then come the four days from Monday to Thursday, each with its peculiarity: 'Monday—the Day of Signs'; 'Tuesday—the Day of Questions.' Even the Seven Words from the Cross are fresh in this preacher's handling. The series closes with Easter Eve and Easter Day.

Since Mr. Stoughton Holborn's article in the *Encyclopædia of Religion and Ethics*, we have seen nothing on Architecture for the use of the student of the subject to be compared with the volume on *Gothic Architecture in England and France* (Bell & Sons; 6s. net), which has been written by Dr. G. H. West. The illustrations in Mr. Holborn's article were done by his own hand; most of the illustrations in Dr. West's book are from photographs. But then many of the photographs have been taken by Dr. West himself, and they have been produced with the utmost care under his own supervision, and they are quite exceptionally good. The volume has a definite purpose. It is a handbook of the knowledge of Gothic Architecture in these two countries, and can literally be carried in the hand. But quite unlike nearly all books of the handbook and guide-book order, it is not overloaded with details. Dr. West's desire is to relate the history and explain the principles of Gothic Architecture. The churches he introduces are accordingly introduced not that they may receive detailed description on their own account, but simply that they may illustrate what he has to say. Good, therefore, as the illustrations are, they are not so good as the letterpress.

Dr. Elizabeth S. Haldane and Dr. G. R. T. Ross have undertaken to produce and publish an English translation of those philosophical works of Descartes which were originally intended for publication. The work will be in two volumes, of which the first has appeared. The title is simply *The Philosophical Works of Descartes* (Cambridge: the University Press; 10s. 6d. net).

The first volume contains a translation of the following six works (we name them for the sake of students who may be studying a particular portion of Descartes, and may wish to know which volume contains it): (1) Rules for the Direction of the Mind; (2) Discourse on the Method of Rightly Conducting the Reason; (3) Meditations on First

Philosophy; (4) The Principles of Philosophy; (5) The Search after Truth; (6) The Passions of the Soul. We have not taken the trouble to compare the translation with the original, for we know the scholarship and conscientiousness of both the translators, and have not the slightest doubt that the meaning is as accurately rendered as it is idiomatically expressed in English.

The Acts of the Apostles is the missionary book of the Bible, and in *Missionary Ideals* (Church Missionary Society; 1s. net) the Rev. T. Walker, M.A., shows how to turn it to best account for the missionary's purposes.

After Eucken, Bergson. In one sense Bergson is before Eucken in popular esteem—he can be more easily read in the original. But he is not more easily understood. And therefore, taking into account both his popularity and his difficulty, Mr. A. D. Lindsay, Fellow and Tutor of Balliol College, Oxford, has turned Bergson into intelligible English, giving us a charming book with the title of *The Philosophy of Bergson* (Dent; 5s. net).

The chief interest and difficulty of Bergson's work, says Mr. Lindsay, lies here: 'As the examination of the possibility of the mathematical sciences led in Kant to a critique of the understanding, the examination of the possibility of the biological sciences leads in Bergson to a critique of intuition.' Bergson's significance therefore lies in his relation to Kant. It is by standing in that relation that he has made his contribution to philosophy. 'Bergson, like Kant, asserts the validity of mathematics by the delimitation of its sphere. Kant, however, because he was concerned wholly with the mathematical sciences, held that what was outside of the sphere of mathematical application was outside of the sphere of knowledge. Hence what was shut out from the operation of the understanding was given over to faith, but a faith divorced from any kind of knowledge could not hold its own. The importance of Bergson's limitation of the sphere of mathematical inquiry is that it makes room for another method of inquiry, which equally with mathematics is concerned with reality, which follows its real articulations and individuality, and which, taking up as it does the results of the exact sciences, enables us to solve those antinomies and contradictions engendered by

a one-sided preoccupation with the mathematical sciences.'

No. xiv. of the 'Semitic Study' series, edited by Professor Richard Gottheil and Morris Jastrow, Jr., is entitled *Selected Babylonian Kudurru Inscriptions*. The author is W. J. Hinke, Ph.D., Professor of Semitic Languages in Auburn Theological Seminary (Leiden: Brill; 6s.).

What is the doctrine of the inward light? Read Dr. Hodgkin's Swarthmore Lecture for 1911, and you will understand. You will understand and appreciate, and even, it may be, become almost a Quaker, believing in the validity of the inward light and rejoicing in the great comfort of it. The title of the Swarthmore Lecture for 1911 is *Human Progress and the Inward Light* (Headley Brothers; 1s. net).

A volume by Mr. A. M. Nicol on *General Booth and the Salvation Army* (Herbert & Daniel; 6s. net) may satisfy the desires of those who wish to know whether the Salvation Army has yet become respectable enough to receive their support. It is not the work of a blind partisan. Most deliberately and almost ostentatiously Mr. Nicol writes as a critic and candid friend. He has had experience of the Army. He has had as much experience as is necessary. He has been long and intimately occupied with its work and identified with its objects. But he does not write as a Salvationist. He now stands at some little distance. And thus he claims the two requisites for the writing of such a book, that is to say, impartiality and knowledge.

Moreover, the book is well written. Its best chapter is the chapter of personal characterization of Mr. Bramwell Booth. He, and not the General, is Mr. Nicol's true hero. And that is very hopeful for the future of the Army.

It comes at the end of the season, yet the volume of sermons that goes by the title of *A North-Country Preacher* should not be lost sight of. The preacher is the late Rev. F. L. Cope, M.A., Hon. Canon of Durham (Sunderland: Hills). The sermons are short; but, unlike most short sermons, they contain a conscientious and scholarly interpretation of the texts. For these interpretations alone the book is noteworthy. But there is also a strain of seriousness, of intense ear-

nest application, which makes the interpretation memorable.

The Rev. J. Robinson Gregory has written *A History of Methodism* (Kelly; 2 vols., 7s. net). The original intention, he tells us, was to have the book included in the Church History section of his brother's 'Books for Bible Students.' But Methodism was too great, and it is too much a matter of world-wide interest now, for its history to be crowded into two volumes of that size. And it was undoubtedly wise to save the book and leave the series to look after itself. After all, the book is very far from being too unwieldy or too long for any serious student to master.

Mr. Gregory has both knowledge and sympathy. That goes without saying. But, besides that, he has no inconsiderable historical gift and no inconsiderable skill as an English writer. His purpose is to tell the story of Methodism simply and truthfully. And that purpose he has accomplished.

When was the multitude, the reading multitude so deeply interested in the philosophers? It is the day of the great fundamental things. We discuss, What is Truth? The little things which separate sects are reckoned of no account. And thus philosophy, which is always occupied with first things, with the process of finding footing has come very close at present to the things of religion. We can scarcely tell whether the late Professor William James should be called a philosopher or a theologian.

The title of his new book, however, is *Some Problems of Philosophy* (Longmans; 4s. 6d. net). Being new, it is therefore posthumous, and has all that disadvantage. He purposed to write a textbook for students in Metaphysics, and, when he found that he should not be able to finish it, 'Say,' he wrote on the manuscript, 'it is fragmentary and unrevised.' Yet it is unmistakably his own. No other man had or has this deftness in the use of the English tongue for philosophical purposes.

One thing at least does undoubtedly characterize our modern preaching and distinguish it from all previous preaching. That thing is the sense of reality. We are on the ground all the time. Our fathers, if they could observe, would scorn us for not rising into the air—the air of the imagination or at least of the eloquent and impassioned sub-

ute for the imagination. But the modern preacher has found that the men and women of to-day are walking on the earth, and he has resolved to come and join himself to them there. So the *Problems of Life* (Macmillan; 3s. net), discussed by the Rev. C. A. Houghton, M.A., Rector of St. Petrock's, Exeter (a typical modern preacher), are such as 'The Voice of Approval,' 'Prayer,' 'Labour,' 'Joy,' 'Sorrow,' 'Pain,' 'The Journey's End,' and 'What is Truth?'

Messrs Morgan & Scott have issued another impression of Gough's *Oration*s (1s. net).

Near as the Psalms are, delightfully near, to the human heart, there are some things in them that are a considerable distance removed from the modern human understanding. And of these things the most remote of all are, strange to say, some of the most vital things, as Life, Death, and Immortality. Perhaps the nearest approach that we can make to an explanation of the difference between the ancient Hebrew and the modern English conception of these things is to say that, to the Hebrew, immortality was of the nation rather than of the individual, while to the modern Englishman it is altogether the other way. In

any case, we need to try to understand these things as the Psalmists understood them, if we are to understand the Psalms. And to that end the Rev. W. O. E. Oesterley, D.D., has published a volume of studies in the Psalms, to which he has given the title of *Life, Death, and Immortality* (Murray; 3s. 6d. net). It is a volume of such studies as only a man who can live in two worlds at once, the ancient and the modern, could write. Dr. Oesterley has worked himself into the Hebrew mind as few men have had the patience to do, and indeed his most passionate desire in life is that Israel may be saved. It is a book which will set many a preacher on the right lines.

Messrs. Pickering & Inglis, of Glasgow, have a series which is called 'Every Christian's Library.' They have just added to it *God's Gospel and God's Righteousness*, by Philip Mauro (1s. net).

Culture of the Christian Heart, by the Rev. J. A. Clapperton, M.A. (R.T.S.; 1s.). Is it the heart in the modern or in the Biblical sense? In the Biblical sense. It includes the will; it is not merely the emotional part of us. And culture? It is not culture as the offset (and antagonist) to religion; it is growth in grace.

Christ's Teaching on Divorce.¹

By THE VEN. WILLOUGHBY C. ALLEN, M.A., ARCHDEACON OF MANCHESTER.

It is often asserted that in His teaching about divorce the Lord lays down a law prohibiting divorce, which is contradicted by the exception permitted in Mt 5³² 19⁹, and the conclusion is drawn that these clauses cannot have been spoken by Him.

But quite apart from the question whether the Lord (even supposing His teaching about divorce to have been intended to be of the nature of a law to be enforced by authority) may not have qualified this law by laying down another law dealing with exceptional cases, there is grave reason to doubt whether His words should be understood to be of the nature of law at all in the sense of an enactment to be enforced.

¹ N.B.—This paper does not deal with re-marriage after divorce.

If, e.g., we take the Sermon on the Mount, the whole of the teaching there, with the exception of this so-called 'law' of divorce, is now generally understood to be of the nature not of law, but of illustrated principle.

E.g. 'I say unto you, Swear not at all.' Who is there now who wishes to interpret this as a law prohibiting all swearing?

'I say unto you, That every one who is angry with his brother shall be liable to the judgment.'

'I say unto you, That every one who looked on a woman to lust after her, hath already committed adultery with her in his heart.'

'I say to you, Resist not the evil one.'

'I say to you, Love your enemies.'

None of these are laws to be enforced by discipline, without exception. They are principles which

are to guide the conduct. On what ground, then, is 'I say unto you, That every one who putteth away his wife, causeth her to commit adultery' to be regarded? not as a general guide to conduct, but as a rigid law to which there can be no exception. In the other cases the Christian Church has long been of the mind that exceptions must be made to (a), whilst in the others there can be no case of making exception, because they are of the nature of principles or ideals to be aimed at, but which few would care to assert that they wholly keep.

So far, then, as the First Gospel goes, the argument that the clause 'except for the sake of fornication' cannot have been spoken by Christ because it contradicts the 'law' of Christ that 'every one who putteth away his wife, causeth her to commit adultery' is invalid. For read in the light of the whole Sermon this command is not a 'law,' but an ideal of conduct, an ideal which every Christian will seek to make the law of his life. But in marriage the maintenance of this ideal depends upon two parties. And what if one live up to, whilst the other fall from it?

Perhaps, however, the objection to the clauses in question may take a different form. It may be said that they are inconsistent with the teaching of the Lord as recorded by three independent witnesses, St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. Paul.

To this we may reasonably answer that there is no good ground for using the word 'inconsistent.' The clauses in question may be supplementary to teaching elsewhere recorded.

As the subject is dealt with most fully in Mark, it may be convenient to deal with that Gospel first.

And it should be noted in passing that many critical writers believe that of the two passages Mt 19⁸⁻¹², Mk 10¹⁻¹², the former contains the most original record of the ultimate facts. In that case our primary gospel record of this incident contained the clauses in question. But since, perhaps, a majority of recent writers believe Matthew to be here secondary as compared with Mark, let us assume that that has been proved. Mark, then, records that Pharisees came to Christ and asked him if it was lawful for a man to put away his wife. Now this is a very extraordinary question to have been asked, for no Jew doubted, or could have doubted, the legality of divorce. The Law of Dt 24¹⁻⁴, as interpreted in the time of Christ, settled that question, though it left doubt as to the legal grounds for divorce. It is clear, there-

fore, that these Pharisees were not asking for any other purpose than to get an answer which they could use as an indictment against Christ. They came, as Mark says, 'tempting' Him. They must, in other words, have had reason to know what the answer would be. And they got what they expected and desired. The Law of Moses was set aside. Appeal was made to the purpose of God in creation, and divorce was declared to be inadmissible.

St. Matthew, when repeating this narrative, has confused it by interpolating into it the exceptive clause, and by modifying it in other ways. He has thereby given a handle to those who jump quickly at conclusions.¹ They argue that because interpolated here the clauses do not belong to the authentic sayings of Christ. That is a very rash conclusion. St. Matthew has elsewhere interpolated into St. Mark's narratives other sayings. Are we immediately to conclude that all these do not belong to Christ's authentic sayings? Many of those who so cheerfully abandon Mt 19^{9b} would be aghast if they were asked to give up 16^{17ff}, and other such interpolations. The question is, where did St. Matthew draw these sayings from? If others come from a source which has preserved authentic sayings of Christ, whether Q, or any other source, why not also 19^{9b}?

To this it is replied that this clause is inconsistent with or contradictory to Christ's teaching in St. Mark, St. Paul, and St. Luke.

But why is it inconsistent? Suppose that Christ's teaching in St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. Paul is intended to be a law binding on all men and to be enforced by authority. Then what reason is there for saying that the clauses in St. Matthew are not of the nature of a supplementary 'law'?

Or better, allow that the stricter teaching is intended to be an ideal to be aimed at by the disciple of Christ. Then the exceptive clause will be a supplementary regulation limiting divorce to the one case where it will sometimes be necessary, namely, in cases where the ideal has been shattered. For what is the principle of marriage implied in the Lord's teaching? It is that marriage is the union, spiritual and physical, of two

¹ The conclusions arrived at in *St. Matthew* ('Int. Crit. Com.') on this subject are open to this charge. But they were not determined by such considerations as those described in the next sentence (above).

whole and complete personalities, a union which is indissoluble, or should be indissoluble, until death, which severs the bond. That is the ideal, but like all God's purposes for men it can be thwarted by human sin, and human sin can break this union. What sin? The sin of fornication which is an act of severance, spiritual and physical, of the marriage bond.¹

Of course the legal tie may remain. But, in fact, the marriage bond has been broken and the exceptive clauses in St. Matthew are a sanction to a recognition of the possible necessity of legal divorce following a divorce which has already taken place in the spiritual and physical sphere. This sanction is, of course, only permissive. There is no command that such divorce (legal) shall take place. But there is the recognition that fornication is an adequate and possibly necessary ground for solving in law a union which has already been dissolved in the sphere of the spirit and of the flesh.

This teaching is clear and consistent. Marriage is a bond which during life should be indissoluble. Two things sever it. Fornication which severs the union of the flesh, that being only the symbol of the severance of the union of the spirit. Death severs it also. The words of Christ deal with principle, not with the application of principle

¹ Chrysostom, *Ep. 1 ad Cor.*, Hom. 19. 3. By fornication 'the marriage is already dissolved.' 'The husband is no longer a husband.'

to legal enactment, except in so far as He implies that legal solution of marriage may in some cases follow its solution in fact.

To this recognition of the fact that Christ's teaching permitted divorce for fornication the early Church held firm. Clement of Alexandria,² Tertullian,³ Cyprian,⁴ Basil,⁵ Gregory of Nazianzen,⁶ Chrysostom,⁷ Epiphanius,⁸ Jerome,⁹ Augustine, Hilary of Poitiers,¹⁰ Ambrosiaster,¹¹ all affirm it.

But in the later Western Church ascetic tendencies fought hard against this exception. It has, however, been reserved for modern writers to go beyond a tacit neglect of these clauses to a positive rejection of them in the interests of ascetic theory. In many respects this modern theory represents a return to Montanism. It tends to try and represent the teaching of Christ as a hard-and-fast 'law' absolutely prohibiting divorce. It should logically, but in the face of the New Testament, describe marriage as a permanently binding tie lasting beyond death, so that second marriages would be un-Christian. And there are signs of a desire to do so, and to represent this Montanist view as 'Catholic.'

² *Strom.*, 2. 23.

³ *De Monog.*, 9; *Adv. Marc.*, 4. 34.

⁴ *De Disciplina*, 6. ⁵ *Ep.*, 188. 9.

⁶ *Orat.*, 37. 8.

⁷ In *Ep. 1 ad Cor.*, Hom. 19. 3.

⁸ *Panarion*, 59. 4.

⁹ *Ep.*, 55. 77.

¹⁰ In *Matt.* 4. 22.

¹¹ In *Ep. 1 ad Cor.*, 7. 10, 11.

The Palinode of the Pharisee.

A STUDY OF THE THIRTEENTH CHAPTER OF 1 CORINTHIANS.

BY THE REV. EDWARD SHILLITO, M.A., LONDON.

IN the passionate opening of this poem we may find memories of the Pharisaism out of which Paul had been delivered. His was an 'experiencing nature,' which had an incomparable experience upon which to work. He is an artist who draws from life, and, whenever he can, from his own life. The words, indeed, look first to the situation of the Corinthians, who had been tempted to dwell too much on their brilliant gifts, and to neglect love; but there is a far-away look in the writer's eye; he is back again in Jerusalem, the zealous Pharisee,

foremost once more in his sect, and yet the chief of sinners; he is turning back to the past, forgiven but not forgotten. He recants once more his former errors; he convicts himself again of his secret fault; he makes his penitent submission to the Lord, who had taught him to love. The Eulogy of Love is the Palinode of the Pharisee. It is never easy to find autobiography in the books of the ancient world; where it is found, it is veiled from profane eyes; the Apostle Paul often uses the discipline of his own spiritual life, but without

saying so. The wise preacher is always using his own experience; but he is foolish who parades it. Paul does not mention the word 'Pharisee' here; but, if we read between the lines, we can see in this praise of love the heart of a Pharisee, laid bare by one who had known it from within.

It is sometimes hard to realize that Paul had been a Pharisee; that he might have heard the 'woes' of the Master, and all the divine invective, poured upon that sect; we are startled when, in place of 'scribes and Pharisees,' we read 'Saul of Tarsus.' Yet he never sought to separate himself from his equals; he had been brought up at the feet of Gamaliel in the strictest sect of the Jews; he had been in it with his mind and soul, and without reservation. *Now he fears lest the sin of that life should be repeated in the Church.* He is like a father who watches with dismay the first signs of his own sin reappear in his children.

What, then, was the sin of the Pharisees? Why did our Lord single them out as the deadliest of His foes? Why did He fling Himself against them as against the line at its strongest? It was not their devotion to ritual, nor even their oppression and inhumanity; these were but expressions of an inward disease, found in the best as well as in the worst of them. Mozley has shown in his powerful sermon on the sect, why it was essential for Jesus to make clear what true goodness was. 'It was essential that a great revelation should be made of human character—a great disclosure of its disguises and pretences, unmasking the evil in it, and extricating and bringing to life the good'; and this Jesus could only do by declaring what was the very structure of morality, 'that particular virtues are nothing without the general ones.' The outward manifestations of goodness seen in the Pharisee did not spring from the true motive; there was zeal, enthusiasm, industry, self-sacrifice, yet all sprang from the root of egotism. 'The gospel was an active religion founded upon love; and Pharisaism was an active religion founded upon egotism. "Verily, I say unto you, they have their reward."' The Pharisees lacked the one thing needful which alone could purify their activity. There were men of the baser sort among them who received rebukes which could not have been deserved by such men as Paul or his teacher Gamaliel. These could never have robbed widows' houses, and for a pretence have made long prayers.

But Paul, too, came under the condemnation of Jesus for his lack of the true springs of action—his inward failure in the midst of outward earnestness and correctness; he had lacked the general virtue which alone gives value to the particular virtues. What is this but love? 'And have no love, I am nothing.'

Those days were long passed for Paul now. Their memory was sweet, as he thought of the grace which had saved him—bitter, as he remembered the waste and failure of it all, ere God took from him the rags of his own righteousness, and clothed him in the righteousness which is by faith. But now in Corinth, under new conditions, in the body of Christ, he saw the hateful thing again. What if there should be Pharisees in the Church. There must have come to Paul a feeling near akin to panic as he saw the intricate and subtle power of this sin. The prince of this world could wound him nowhere so easily as here in his children. Their gifts were manifold, but were they to have zeal without love? Had Paul been saved to preach to men who would read *his experience backwards*, and pass from the liberty of the glory of the sons of God to the specious and joyless way of Pharisaism? This dread gives vehemence and intensity to the opening words of this chapter; he must save his readers at all costs; he must show to them in startling and emphatic lines the door of a loveless life.

We begin to tell why it was the Saviour singled out this phase of evil. It was certain to be a snare in every age to every soul which passed into the life of the Spirit. It was no temptation for the unawakened, but through its searching test the religious man *must* pass. The Pharisee would be always with men. Paul must have realized when he wrote this chapter that Jesus had made no error in perspective in his attacks. He saw the Corinthians threatened by the same shades of the same prison. So the Apostle in his own way prolongs the note in the Master's teaching, and tells the woes of the Pharisee. He is as sounding brass or a clanging cymbal; he is nothing.

We are made to see two pictures. In the one panel a man of religious zeal, with the gift of speech, used constantly for the preaching of Christ—a golden voice often heard in the assemblies of the Church. In the other panel we see Paul in his Pharisee days, speaking to his fellows with the eloquence which made the men of Lystra call him

Mercury; we watch him in the Sanhedrin, or in the synagogues. He had never left his talent unused; but why had he spoken? He knew the fatal defect. Now in the Christian Church, the object of his prayers night and day, what if men might preach Christ, as he had preached Moses, with the tongues of men and of angels—yet without love? It is as if Paul said, 'I became—you are become, if that is your case—sounding brass.'

Then there are two more pictures. There is the wise Corinthian, with an amazing grasp of revelation; he has all wisdom and all knowledge; he is mighty in the Scriptures, and can walk freely where others stumble. And with this picture there comes the memory of the young Pharisee—apt pupil of a great teacher, outstripping his fellows, mighty in the Scriptures; but still—as *nothing*. All his energy of thought had been vitiated by the lack of love. The factors in the two lives were the same. There is one point of division between men: outward acts, even intellectual conviction, may be common to the Pharisee-Christian and to the true Christian, but the one is without love, and the other has it, and the lives are leagues apart.

Paul calls up pictures stranger still. There is a Corinthian, he seems to say, who would rather die than deny his faith. Put the hardest case! The stake and the faggots and the burning flesh! Paul does not shrink; he knew enough of his own heart to set himself side by side with this martyr-soul. He, too, when he had been a Pharisee, would have given his body to be burned. He had known

some zealot in his own country lead a wild and ineffective mob against the Roman power, and to certain death. He knew that he would have done the like at the bidding of his faith, and he knew that this would have been *nothing*. It might be nothing in the life of that fearless Corinthian, waiting and even longing to die for Christ,—if he were without love. Paul knew that this was not impossible.

In other words, he was face to face with a resurrection of the old spirit of the Pharisee within the new Israel. Sins do not die; they come to life in forms most likely to betray the new generation; they come in new garments, but they are the same. Pharisaism is the subtlest and deadliest of sins, for it waits the soul, not in the gloomy valleys of irreligion, but on the upper reaches of the way; and by its aid there is an avenue to hell from the very gates of heaven. Paul would put his children on their guard; and he puts all the generations—and ours not least—on their guard. To us the New Testament stands as the classic counsel both of reproof and exhortation. The sins it attacks are not the sins of one, but of every age. Jesus has written in words of strange terrors the ultimate doom of a religious life without love; Paul echoes the teaching of the Master out of the diary of his own heart. Jesus had taught the lesson of the Pharisees in Israel; now one of that school was seeking to reveal to the new Israel that the life which has everything else but lacks love, comes to nothing.

Recent Foreign Theology.

The Teaching of the Apostles.

THIS is a peculiarly hard book to review,¹ depending as it does for its impression very much on patiently accumulated detail. A year since, Professor Schlatter issued a substantial volume on the Teaching of Jesus, and this work, completing his New Testament Theology, deals at full length with the teaching of the apostles. It differs considerably alike in tone and method from any

other general work of its class. Perhaps its most striking peculiarity is the emphasis everywhere laid on the ethical side of New Testament religion. Faith, for the writer, is an activity; to be a Christian is to be engrossed in a work. It is singular also to find John treated before Paul. The style is fatiguingly granular, with little fluency in either thought or composition. Professor Schlatter gets his effect through the steady impact of many brief, unadorned, staccato sentences, much like a man hammering a nail persistently into a hard block. Also he has a leaning to epigram, not always of the perspicuous sort. The chief

¹ *Die Lehre der Apostel.* Von Professor A. Schlatter, Tübingen. Calw und Stuttgart: Verlag d. Vereinsbuchhandlung, 1910. Pp. 592. M.8.

lack in his mind appears to be simplicity. This is regrettable, for he is a man of immense knowledge, and there can be few students of the New Testament who are better able to realize the Judaistic and Hellenistic background of its ideas.

Part I. deals with the religious beliefs of Jesus' personal companions. They come in the order—Matthew, James, Jude, John, and Peter; and it is assumed rather than expressly stated that Schlatter takes extremely conservative positions in regard to what is usually called Introduction. So far there is nothing objectionable, provided only the reasons assigned are good; but here virtually no reasons are given,—only conclusions. With a single unimportant exception, the views of other scholars are ignored, in the sense that they are nowhere discussed in set terms, with references to the literature. This, I fear, will make the book disconcerting, and, so far, unprofitable, to a wide circle. And as Schlatter could have quite well held his own in the busy modern discussion, we should have welcomed all the more a careful statement of his grounds for differing, as he does constantly, from the conclusions of the root-and-branch men. Were this Olympian attitude abated somewhat, and more frequent concessions made to the human weakness for relevancy, little or nothing would be lost, and the student would obtain much more useful guidance.

Schlatter accepts without demur the Johannine authorship of all the writings traditionally ascribed to John, and will hear nothing of an interpretation of the Apocalypse which makes it Jewish save for a few phrases. (At this point, however, we are scarcely impressed by the wisdom of the remark that no two Epistles reveal so much affinity of spirit as those of John and James.) There is no sacramentalism in the Fourth Gospel, nor yet any discussion of intellectual problems. The Johannine contribution to thinking lies really in a final exposition of Divine Sonship. And the freedom with which John treats particular episodes in Jesus' life rests, we are told, 'on the conviction that Jesus' work did not consist in this deed or that of His earthly mission, nor its indispensableness in its immediate results, but in the fact rather that His words and works give visibility and effect to those inward spiritual possessions of His which reveal Him as Son.' There is a specially good paragraph on the Hellenistic element in John, who yet owes nothing to Philo, and uses terms such as Logos, with which

history supplied him, in a spirit of sovereign freedom. His basal idea is not sin, but faith; and of religious psychology he has comparatively little. He has reached a standpoint at which the Cross has ceased to be enigmatic; rather it is now the great fact from which light streams out over the entire field, revealing incomparably the Sonship, glory, and grace of the Redeemer.

John, however, fell heir to a great Pauline legacy; and the difference between the two great apostles, as well as their resemblance, is treated with sympathy and understanding. Schlatter enjoys these studies in contrast: James and Paul, John and Matthew, Paul and the writer of Hebrews. Once we get his point of view they are always instructive, even if occasionally overdone. John makes us see the unity of Jesus with God—this is a specially helpful page. So does Paul in his own way, for his Christ is after all the very Christ of the Gospels. Immense stress is rightly laid on the experimental character of Paul's theology: we ought to think of it as Paul's theology, not as Paulinism, which is an abstract noun, and gets detached too easily from the living man. So we are shrewdly warned here against the perils of overmuch theorizing or systematization. Paul's *obiter dicta* as to the connexion of our sinful state with Adam have been fatally hardened into dogma; they had no such prominence in his own mind. Here too the ethical aspect of things is in the foreground. The standards by which Paul condemned Judaism were standards more of morals than of theology; Judaism stood convicted of fear, Gnosticism of pride. He makes only a sparing use of Greek thought-forms. Nothing in the volume is better, I should say, than the masterly treatment of justification as it appears in the Pauline letters, though probably it might have helped us to follow Schlatter's argument with more confidence if he had explained precisely the significance of 'the Law' for Paul's mind. We are shown, however, that traditional theology has often read things into the Apostle of which he never dreamt. Nowhere does he speak of Christ's 'merit,' though he speaks constantly of His righteousness; and when he alludes to our Lord's higher being it is not in terms of His divine 'nature' (on the whole an impersonal word), but in terms of His divine 'form' (Ph 2), which has a decidedly more personal complexion. Will, too, is for him the essence of personality, human and divine. Another noteworthy

remark is, that Paul's contribution to the doctrine of the Spirit consists not, as we are sometimes told, in a moralization of the idea of the Spirit, but in his having signalized the complete unity and coherence of the work of the Spirit and the work of Christ. For Paul the Spirit is something over and above Christ Himself; it gives an inward experience of Christ, the last proof of Divine love.

Do what we will, Schlatter's ideas too often preserve a certain opaque and fuliginous character. But for those who appreciate hard reading, and are resolved not to let themselves be blinded to the deep feeling that may lie behind difficult and sometimes cryptic words, his new volume may be warmly commended. Whatever its defects of manner, as a religious exposition of New Testament thought it compares more than favourably with Holtzmann (of whose work a new, posthumous edition has just been announced); though for a sound theological education it will long be perilous to dispense with the older treatise.

H. R. MACKINTOSH.

Edinburgh.

A Survey.

THE CHURCH.

IN a survey of recent literature on the Church—a survey which does not profess to be complete, but simply includes such works as have been received for review—a good beginning will be made with the new volume of the *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum*. It was in the year 1866 that this great series began to appear, that is, forty-six years ago, and this is the forty-sixth volume. Apart from the *Corpus*, there is no collection of the Latin ecclesiastical writers like Migne's *Patrologia Latina*. But those who have made any considerable use of Migne have come to the sorrowful conclusion that its scholarship is not always to be relied upon, that indeed it is sometimes seriously defective. There was therefore not only room for the new series, but very great need for it. Two things were firmly resolved upon: completeness and accuracy. And these two things have been carried throughout the series, without a single failure so far as we know. It is the consistency of its scholarship that gives the *Corpus* its chief advantage over Migne. In form, however, it

has another advantage, the ordinary octavo being more easily handled than the folio, even when it is a small folio.

The new volume is the first dealing with the works of Rufinus of Aquileia. The editor is Augustus Engelbrecht, who has made use of the materials collected by Wrobel—*Tyrannii Rufini Opera, Pars. I.: Orationum Gregorii Nazianzeni Novem Interpretatio* (Williams & Norgate; 12s. 6d.).

After the *Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum* comes the series entitled *Die Griechischen Christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*, of which all the volumes as they appeared have been noticed in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. It comes after only because it is of more recent birth and, up to the present, of less extent. But no work could surpass the Greek Christian Writers of the First Three Centuries whether in scholarship or in completeness. It is puzzling that nothing has been done to produce an English edition. One of the great University Presses might have undertaken it. We cannot help thinking, indeed, that the work should have been an international one from the beginning. There are British and American scholars who could have taken their place beside these great German editors without disparagement.

The new issue is *The Church History of Theodoret*. It appears in one handsome volume of cviii + 427 large octavo pages, under the editorship of Dr. Léon Parmentier, Professor in the University of Lüttich (Hinrichs; M.17). There is no doubt that it will supersede all other editions of Theodoret in the market.

Messrs. J. C. B. Mohr of Tübingen have issued a short history of the Church, somewhat after the manner of Kurtz, but of independent research and independent judgment—*Kompendium der Kirchengeschichte* von Karl Heussi, Dr. Phil. (M.9). The author's aim is to furnish not a readable history, but a manual of historical facts so arranged as to catch the student's eye, save his time, and aid his memory. The book will be used, not only by the beginner, but also by those who have any advanced work to do in the history of the Church, on account of the fulness of its biographical references, and the ease with which one can catch them by means of an admirable index.

The second volume has appeared of H. Appel's *Kurze Geschichte der Kirchengeschichte für Studierende*. It contains the history of the Mediæval Church—

Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters (Leipzig: Deichertsche Verlagsbuchhandlung. M.3.80).

Two new volumes on the Odes of Solomon should be introduced by a volume on the Psalms of Solomon. It is a new edition with an introduction, Greek text and French translation, by Dr. J. Viteau. The meaning of the new edition appearing at this time, however, is that Professor Martin, of the Institut Catholique of Paris, wished to add to the text the various readings found in the Syriac Version. Perhaps this alone is sufficient to give the new edition the first place for the study of the Psalms of Solomon. But in every respect it is an edition of the highest value—*Les Psaumes de Salomon* (Paris: Letouzey et Ané. Fr. 6.75).

Of the two editions of the Odes of Solomon before us one is French, and one is German. The French edition is edited by J. Labourt and P. Batiffol—*Les Odes de Salomon* (Paris: Lecoffre). It contains first a translation of the Odes into French with footnotes, and then a long introduction which is both historical and critical. It would have been an advantage to the authors if they had had Martin's *Les Psaumes de Salomon* in their hands, but that was impossible. With the literature in existence when they wrote they seem to be familiar. The date which they assign to the Odes is 100–120 A.D., and they have no hesitation in assigning it, for they place it on their title-page.

The title of the other volume is *Die Oden Salomos unter Berücksichtigung der überlieferten Stichengliederung*. It has been translated from Syriac into German and a Commentary has been added by Lic. Dr. G. Diettrich, Pfarrer der Reformationskirche in Berlin (Berlin: Trowitzsch & Sohn. M.5). This edition will do for German readers very much what Professor Rendel Harris's own edition does for English readers. It is shorter, however, than Professor Rendel Harris's second edition, and suffers considerably from having been published before it. No doubt Dr. Diettrich will give his readers a new edition of his book after he has had time to work through the most recent literature.

Messrs. Beauchesne et C^{ie} of Paris are the publishers of a series of studies in historical theology, which are to be issued under the direction of the Professors of Theology of the Institut Catholique. From the two volumes already issued we can obtain some conception of the purpose of these studies, and the style in which they are to

appear. The first volume is entitled *Didyme l'Aveugle*; the author is Dr. Gustave Bardy. The second volume is *Pascal*, by Professor H. Petitot, of Jerusalem (Fr.6). Both volumes are distinctly theological. The biographical element is reduced to the smallest dimensions. In the case of Pascal we have an account of his first and second conversions, but this is given not as a contribution to the study of the life of Pascal, but as a contribution to the study of conversion. Both works are marked by distinct ability, and by a most welcome breadth of treatment. The subjects chosen for discussion are subjects of universal and, one might add, eternal interest, and the method of discussion in both volumes is what one might be allowed to call truly Catholic. For both the authors are scholars, and they have evidently been strong enough to insist upon it that scholarship should come first. The volumes are not merely valuable additions to the study of theology; they are a valuable evidence of the superiority of truth over convenience.

The same publishers have issued in a handsome volume the correspondence and papers of Bellarmin for the period preceding his Cardinalate. The volume has been edited by Professor Xavier-Marie le Bachelet, S.J., who says that he had two objects in view in undertaking the book. First of all he found that there were in existence an immense number of unpublished letters and papers, that indeed scarcely any of the letters belonging to the first three-quarters of Bellarmin's life had ever seen the light. He accordingly determined to publish them. The other reason was that there is no scientific biography of Bellarmin in existence. There are panegyrics and pious biographies in abundance, but they are all apologetic in purpose and unreliable as history. Professor le Bachelet does not think that the time has come for producing an unbiassed biography, but the materials for it must be collected, and this book is accordingly published 'as a contribution to a complete history of Bellarmin—a history of his life, his character, his writings, and his influence.' It is a fine volume of nearly 600 pages, and it contains amongst other things a thorough and methodical bibliography.

Messrs. Beauchesne are also the publishers in Paris for the books of the Bibliothèque Slave of Brussels, and in that series they have issued a monograph by Michel D'Herbigny of Vladimir.

Soloviev (Fr.3.50), the Russian Newman. 'The Russian Newman' is the title which M. D'Herbigny himself gives to Soloviev, and the comparison with Newman is carried out in detail through the first chapter, while it is present to the author's mind throughout the whole book. It is certainly a skilfully written biography, and will be read by those who are interested in psychological problems as well as by those who are interested in the problems of the modern Church.

SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.

Das Gewissheitsproblem in der systematischen Theologie bis zu Schleiermacher, von Karl Heim, Privatdozent der Theologie in Halle (Hinrichs. M.12), is a thorough investigation of a subject that is at present in very great need of being thoroughly investigated. Herr Heim's method is historical. He divides his book into two parts. Part I. deals with the problem of Certainty before the Reformation, Part II. with its history from the Reformation to Schleiermacher. No man can follow the historical method of investigation without affording us at least an occasional glimpse of his own mind. But Herr Heim is as faithful to the method and as self-obliterating as most men. The discussion is carried through the centuries with unflinching clearness and proportion. The quotations made are never lengthy, but they are pertinent and accurate. Those who are annotating their copy of THE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF RELIGION AND ETHICS should add this book to the literature which Professor Tasker appends to his article on 'Certainty' in the third volume.

A curious mixture of a book is Herr Heinrich Scholz's *Glaube und Unglaube in der Weltgeschichte* (Hinrichs. M.5). It is further described on the title-page as 'Ein Kommentar zu Augustins De Civitate Dei.' And we are yet further informed that it contains an Excursus on *Fruitio Dei*, which is offered as a contribution to the history of Theology and of Mysticism.

What are the central problems in Dogmatics at present? Professor Ihmels of Leipzig says they are these six: (1) The Relation between Faith and Dogma; (2) The Authority of Christianity; (3) Revelation; (4) The Person of Jesus; (5) The Work of Jesus in its abiding Significance for the Church; (6) Assurance. To each of these subjects Professor Ihmels has given a lecture, and the

six lectures have been published under the title of *Centralfragen der Dogmatik in der Gegenwart* (Leipzig: Deichert. M.2.80).

Professor L. Labauche of the Séminaire de Saint-Sulpice has published the first volume of what looks like his class notes, under the title of *Leçons de Théologie Dogmatique*. This first volume is occupied with the subject of God. It is divided into three parts—the first part on the Trinity, the second on the Incarnate Word, and the third on Christ as Redeemer (Paris: Bloud et C^{ie}. Fr.5).

We have from the same publishers a more detailed treatment of the doctrine of the Trinity, although it consists almost entirely of quotations and condensations, the greater number of them being from Aquinas. The title is *La Sainte Trinité*, and the author M. L. Berthé, Hon. Canon of Évreux (Bloud et C^{ie}. Fr.5).

The doctrine of sacred Scripture according to the Roman Catholic Church is described in a book written in Latin under the title of *De Scriptura Sacra* (Beauchesne et C^{ie}). The author is M. J. V. Bainvel. The subject is for the Roman Catholic Church one of intense concern at present, and on such a subject as Holy Scripture what concerns the Roman Catholic Church concerns us all.

COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

Professor Julius Grill of Tübingen has translated the Tao-te-king into German, and published his translation, together with a full introduction and detailed commentary, under the title of *Lao-tsches Buch vom höchsten Wesen und vom höchsten Gut* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr. M.4.50). The whole work is a triumph of scholarship. Scholars of Chinese are not too numerous, but as a rule they are scholars. Professor Grill is one of the most distinguished. And the publishers deserve credit for their handsome and artistic share in the work.

In *Monismus und Monotheismus* Professor Georg Wobbermin of the University of Breslau has given us a welcome discussion of the fundamental problem of materialism—welcome for its merciless exposure of the absurdity of a Godless universe, and welcome for the popular simplicity of its thought. When we get down among the fundamentals of life we are all able to understand. It is either confusion of thought or inadequacy of language that makes a writer unintelligible

(Tübingen : Mohr ; London : Williams and Norgate. M.4).

In two volumes, and under the title of *Où en est l'Histoire des Religions?* we are offered a new introduction to Comparative Religion. The first volume deals with the non-Christian religions, and is now published ; the second volume, which is expected to be ready in December, will deal with Judaism and Christianity. That is so, although it seems to imply that Judaism is a Christian religion. The different chapters have been written by different men, among whom we notice Professor de la Vallée Poussin of Brussels, who writes on the religions of India, and Baron Carra de Vaux, whose subject is Muhammadanism. The choice of these men alone shows that the work is meant to be reliable. Popular it may be, but not in the old and almost obsolete use of that word. No Frenchman can ever be unpopular, but some Frenchmen can also be thoroughly scientific and verifiable. These authors have evidently been chosen with considerable care, and every one of them for the particular department of which he has made himself master. After each chapter there is a full account given of the special literature of the subject.

But the most attractive part of this first volume is the introduction. The introduction is the work of M. J. Bricout, Editor of the *Revue du Clergé français*. Now it is a significant thing that the editor of such a review should consider it necessary to edit a volume like this. He has evidently discovered that the time has come when the clergy of France must one and all not only know that there is such a thing as the study of Religion, but also study it. That he himself has studied the

whole subject to some purpose the introduction very plainly declares. The work is published in Paris by Messrs. Letouzey et Ané. (2 vols., Fr.12).

Under the title of *Conférences de Saint-Étienne*, a small volume has been published containing a survey of recent Palestinian digging and discussion. Lagrange writes on the Biblical Sites, Dhorme on the Aryans before Cyrus, Abel on the Capture of Jerusalem by the Arabs, Génier on Napoleon in Syria, Créchet on De Vogüé, Germer-Durand on Palestinian Sculpture, and Dom Zéphyrin Biever on the Country bordering on the Sea of Galilee (Paris : Lecoffre [J. Gabalda et C^{ie}]. M.3.50).

A volume of lectures on the borderland between Religion and Ethics by Dr. Erich Schaefer, Professor of Theology in Kiel, has been published under the title of *Religiös-sittliche Gegenwartsfragen* (Leipzig : Deichert. M.4). The titles of the lectures are : Jesus and Great Men ; Christ and Nature ; and so on.

We may note here, although they do not strictly belong to this department, other two small volumes issued by the same publishers, both dealing with the historical existence of Jesus. One of the volumes is by Dr. Jeremias ; its title is *Hat Jesus Christus gelebt?* (M.1). The author of the other is Herr K. Dunkmann, Direktor des Kgl. Prediger-Seminars in Wittenberg ; the title is *Der historische Jesus, der mythologische Christus, und Jesus der Christ* (M.2).

Dr. Max Green of Philadelphia has had his recent book on the Jews translated into German under the title of *Die Judenfrage und der Schlüsse zu ihrer Lösung*. The translator is Elizabeth Delitzsch (Hinrichs. M.1.75).

The Archaeology of the Book of Genesis.

BY THE REV. A. H. SAYCE, D.D., LL.D., D.LITT., PROFESSOR OF ASSYRIOLOGY, OXFORD.

Chapter iv.

19. The two wives of Lamech are the Babylonian Uddatu, 'Daylight,' and Tsillatu, the 'Shadow' of Night. Disciples of the 'Astral Theory' will doubtless see in this a proof that Lamech was one of the heavenly bodies, but it would be just as easy to conjecture that the duties of the 'libation priest'

had to be performed during the night as well as during the day.

20, 21. Jabal corresponds with *ibila*, as Hebe does with *abil* (see note on v.²), and is therefore merely a variant of the latter. Hence, like Abel, he is a representative and 'father' of the nomad

Beduin with their flocks and herds.¹ Jubal is an example of those jingling variations of a name of which the Arab is still so fond (see note on 1²). The statement that Jubal was the 'father' of musicians must be a note added by the Hebrew translator, since it depends on the association of his name with the peculiarly Heb. *yôbél*, 'jubilee.' The harp and pipe (A.V. 'organ') were used in the ritual mourning for Tammuz: the pipe was known to the Beduin, but the harp belonged rather to civilized life. It is possible that Jubal has been substituted for an original 'Nukhum the agriculturist' (see note on 5²⁹).

22. In 'Tubal the Smith,' Tubal is another example of Arab fondness for a jingle, Jubal and Tubal being parallel to Abil and Qabil, *i.e.* Cain and Abel, in the modern legends of Damascus. Judging from Arabic analogies, the original name of Tubal would have begun with a dental. In Assyrian, *tublu* means 'the choicest' or 'best'; the gods, for example, are said to have 'predetermined the creation of mankind, their choicest work).'

Naamah was the West Semitic title of Istar, transcribed Nemanoun by the Greeks (Plut. *De Is. et Osir.* 13), which re-appears in Astro-nomê and Astynomê, *i.e.* Istar-na'amah. That Naamah was Istar was known to the Rabbis, who accordingly make her a demon of the night, a wife of the planet Mars, and a mother of the demon of lust (see Lenormant, *Origines de l'Histoire*, i. pp. 201, 202). Since Istar was the evening star, she could well be described as a daughter of the 'Shadow' of Night. The Babylonians made her the daughter, sometimes of the Moon-god, sometimes of Anu the Sky, and therefore the sister of the Moon-god, who was known as 'the Smith' (see note on v.¹⁸).

The three sons of Lamech answer to the three sons of Adam on the one side, and of Noah on the other. Jabal and Abel are variants of the same name; Jubal is related to Abel, as Seth 'the Beduin' is to Abel the shepherd; and as Cain 'the Smith' stands apart from Abel and Seth, so Tubal 'the Smith' is born of a different mother from his two brothers. It is the same tradition in a new form, in which the invention of metallurgy instead of the building of a city is ascribed to 'the

Smith.' Since Ummanum in the Babylonian antediluvian list means 'artisan' in general, and not 'smith' specifically, the list justified the assignment to Cain of the origination of civilization in general, and not of metallurgy in particular, and the account of Tubal Cain will consequently not have been derived from it. Hence the Lamech of the Cainite genealogy cannot be taken from the same cuneiform document as the Lamech of the Sethite genealogy, and this cuneiform document did not conclude, like the latter, with Utu-napistim or Noah. We can thus restore the original cuneiform document, which would have resembled the dynastic tablets and have contained merely 'the dynasty of Sippara,' followed by the first king of the dynasty of Surippak. The variant story of the three sons of the first man (in which the origin of metallurgy was described) was accordingly transferred by the Hebrew writer (*not* translator) from the first man (Amelum) of the dynasty of Sippara, to whom it had never been attached in the Babylonian records, to the first man of the dynasty of Surippak. Hence we have the story in its West Semitic form associated, first of all, with Adam, the first man of the dynasty of Babylon in the post-Khammu-rabi list; and secondly, in what was probably its Babylonian form, with Lamech. The fact that Jabal and his brothers were sons of the first man throws light on the names of their mothers.

The words, 'a hammerer of every artificer in copper and iron,' are senseless. The Septuagint has boldly changed the text, and so obtained the intelligible 'he was a smith, an artificer in bronze and iron.' But *lotêsh*, 'hammerer,' and *horêsh*, 'artificer,' are merely alternative renderings of the Assyrian *nappakhu*. The original was either *restû sa* (or *abu*) *kal nappakhi erî u parzilli* (or simply *nappakhu erî u parzilli*). In Hebrew there is only one word, *nêhosheth*, for both 'copper' and 'bronze.' This has been explained by Mr. Macalister's excavations at Gezer, which have shown that in Palestine the Bronze Age goes back to a very remote date—to a period, in fact, preceding the introduction of bronze into Egypt in the time of the Twelfth Dynasty. Bronze came to Palestine, and thence to Egypt, from Asia Minor, which, so far as we know at present, was the earliest seat of its manufacture. From hence, in the Khammu-rabi age, it made its way to Assyria. But it never obtained a footing in Babylonia, where the use of copper went back to prehistoric times, and continued down to

¹ Yabliya, it is worth noting, was the chief god of the West Semitic Shuhites on the western bank of the Euphrates (Bu. 88-5-12. 5, and my article in the *Proceedings S.B.A.*, Jan. 1899, pp. 24-25).

the Persian era. Bronze was, however, naturally known there, and there were accordingly different words for copper and bronze—*erû*, from the Sumerian *urûdu*, being 'copper,' and *šiparru* (Sumerian *zabar*) being 'bronze' (see my *Archæology of the Cuneiform Inscriptions*, p. 55, *seq*). The use of iron cannot be dated much earlier than 1600 B.C.

23, 24. The old poem, of which an extract is given here, seems to have been of West Semitic origin, like the saying about Nimrod (10⁹), but the metrical form of Hebrew poetry, with its elaborate parallelism, is now known to have been of Babylonian origin. The A.V. is probably right in holding that the names of Adah and Zillah were not mentioned in it. 'I slew a man at the wounding of me, and a boy at the smiting of me'; Ass. *amela aduk ana makhâtsi-ya* (or *mikhtsi-ya*) *û lida ana tarâki-ya*. *Ana* is used like *אֲנִי* here in the Tel el-Amarna tablets.

'Since seven times was Cain (the Smith) avenged, and Lamech (the Priest) seventy and seven.' Seven was a sacred number among the Babylonians, from whom the belief spread to the Western Semites; and a common Babylonian phrase is *adi šibi*, 'up to seven times.' So in the Penitential Psalms the penitent is made to say, 'Seven times seven are my transgressions.' The doctrine of blood-revenge, however, refers us to the West Semitic Beduin rather than to the Babylonians (see note on vv.^{11, 12}). But slaying a man who had wounded the slayer, or a boy who had smitten him, was not blood-revenge; nor was Cain avenged, since no one had murdered him. It was Abel who ought to have been avenged. The 'marginal note,' therefore, appended to the verse of the old poem does not harmonize with it, and implies either that the poem was misunderstood, or that our present text is not the original one. Or is it, not a marginal note, but another fragment of the same or another poem, the Hebrew rendering of which has been wrongly punctuated? The Assyrian would be *kî adi šibi Ummanu yutir gimilla*, which would mean 'since Ummanu avenged himself seven times.' 'Vengeance has been exacted for Cain' would be *kî ilu gimilla sa Ummani yutir adi šibi*. If the Hebrew has been translated from a Babylonian original, that original must have been the first of these phrases rather than the second. Cain and Lamech would thus have been avenging injuries done to themselves. This looks as if, in the Babylonian version of the narrative, 'the

Smith' used the weapons he had forged in order to defend himself against Beduin raiders. Lamech would then have been defending his wives against hostile attack, and would consequently have been justified in boasting to them of his prowess. The priest would have proved himself a better warrior even than the smith. The mutilated Babylonian poem which is known as the 'Creation Legend of Kutha' contained something similar, and described how army after army of *ummâni* was sent forth from 'the field of Akkad,' after 'the sons of the seer' had been summoned, and seven times seven lambs sacrificed—only to be annihilated by the foe.

The original of the verses quoted from the Poem of Lamech may therefore be thus restored:

Simiâ qûli, assât Ramki, uzna sukunâ,
Assum (or kî) amela aduk ana mikhtsi-ya, û lida ana tarâki-ya;
Assum (or kî) adi šibi Ummânu yutira gimilla,
û Ramku adi šibâ û šibi.

'Hear my voice! O wives of Ramku, give ear!
Since a man have I slain for my wounding, and
youth for my smiting;
Since Ummânu took sevenfold vengeance,
And Ramku seventy and sevenfold.'

25. The name is given by Eve (not as in 5³ b. Adam), and so is not assumed to be already existing as in the case of Cain and Abel (vv.^{1, 2}). Hence that Eve should give a reason for the name is natural. The explanation of it, however, is merely a Hebrew popular etymology. In Nu 24¹ the Moabites are called 'the children of Sheth' in a passage that had already ceased to be understood in the age of Jeremiah (if the Massoretic text is to be trusted). Jeremiah (48⁴⁵) quotes it changing קָרַקַר, 'destroying,' and שֵׁת, which were no longer intelligible, into קֶדֶד, 'head,' and צָחֹן, 'tumult.' Sheth, however, is the Assyro-Babylonian Šutu, the name given to the West Semitic nomads on the western side of the Euphrates and borrowed at a very early date by the Egyptians, to whom it was applied to the Beduin of the Sinai Peninsula and Western Asia generally. Moab was a son of Šutu, as Ammon was of 'Ammi (Gn 19³⁸). Sheth, consequently, will have exactly replaced Abel, the representative of the West Semitic shepherds.

The Septuagint supplies the word 'saying,' which has dropped out of the Heb. text. *Zera' ahêd*, 'on seed,' for 'a son,' is an Assyrianism (*estin ziru*).

26. For Enosh, 'Man,' the duplicate of Adam

see above, note on v.¹⁷. 'Then'—*i.e.* at the time of the birth of Enosh—'men were first named after Yahweh.' (The Septuagint has derived הוּלַל from הָלַל, and so translated 'he hoped' instead of 'began.') The statement is in accordance with monumental facts. Already in the age of Khammu-rabi the Babylonian legal documents show that Šutu or West Semitic names were compounded with that of Yahum (Yahweh); *e.g.* Ya(h)um-ilu, the later Joel. In the Kassite period (from 1800 B.C.) such names are fairly common in Babylonia, and the feminine Yaûtum, the exact correspondent of יהוה, is employed along with Yâum or Yâu.

In the lexical tablets Yâu is given as a synonym of *ilu*, 'god.' See note on 2⁴. Šumu-Yâu, 'The Name (Shem) is Yahweh,' would have been a name analogous to Šumu-ilu (Samuel), 'The Name is God,' or other similar compounds, which we actually find in the legal documents of the Khammu-rabi age.

The latter part of the verse is an extract from a work which may be called 'The Book of Origins,' and of which the Assyrian title would have been 'Enuma'; see note on 6¹. Besides 6¹, other extracts from the book are to be found in 9²⁰ and 10¹⁰.

Contributions and Comments.

The Christian Doctrine of Man.¹

PROFESSOR WHEELER ROBINSON'S book is a comprehensive and masterly survey of the main problems of Christian anthropology from the most modern historical and psychological standpoint. The Biblical data on the subject are first of all passed in review, every term used being carefully examined. Then there is traced the working up of this material into the creeds and dogmas of the historic Church. Finally we have an estimate of the degree in which the Christian doctrine of man has been influenced by modern science and philosophy and the social movement.

Many matters of the deepest interest come to light in the course of the discussion. It is shown, for example, that to the Hebrew consciousness personality was an indissoluble unity of soul and body, rather than a mere union between the two, and that nowhere in the whole Bible is any taint of evil attributed to the flesh itself, as the physical basis of life. The dim, unethical conception of 'corporate personality,' so well illustrated in early Hebrew thought, is traced in its development till it changes into the full consciousness of individual relationship to God, with the demand for a future life to satisfy its claims. An illuminating section is devoted to the teaching of Jesus on the nature of man, his sinfulness, his infinite worth to God, and

his capacity for fellowship with the Father, through the service of his brethren. In the discussion of the Pauline anthropology, the apostle is cleared, in a very interesting way, from some serious misconceptions which have persistently clung to his teaching on the subject of original sin, and the relation between sin and death.

With the post-Biblical period comes the influence of Greek thought on Christianity, characterized by a metaphysical dualism, and an emphasis on immortality rather than resurrection. Here, too, emerges the great figure of Augustine, whose championship of the sovereignty of divine grace was of the utmost importance to the development of Christian thought, even though it led to the exaggeration of that sovereignty in the Calvinistic doctrines of election and reprobation. In the modern period the eschatological background of Christianity is replaced by one of cosmic evolution, while at the same time the power and authority of the Church, as the promulgator of infallible dogma, are sensibly relaxed. But it is shown that neither of these changes seriously affects the fundamental Christian doctrines, or the experiences on which they are based. Science has not been able to challenge the higher moral consciousness of the freedom of the will, with its attendant sense of guilt, and has made enormous positive contributions to the enrichment of Christian thought. The most recent philosophy has powerfully vindicated our faith in the spiritual value of personality, and its necessary persistence into another sphere. Even the social emphasis of to-day has not suc-

¹ *The Christian Doctrine of Man.* By the Rev. H. Wheeler Robinson, M.A., Tutor in Rawdon College, Sometime Senior Kennicott Scholar in the University of Oxford. (T. & T. Clark; 6s. net.)

ceeded in diminishing the importance of the human soul, whose worth, indeed, it exists chiefly to subserve. A brief discussion of the rival interpretations of human nature, such as those advanced by Nietzsche, Christian Science, and the apostles of humanitarianism, concludes the volume.

We do not know which to admire the more in this work, the painstaking, minute analysis of each stage of the doctrinal development, or the clear outline of the argument as it advances throughout the book. The uniqueness of human personality as an ultimate, spiritual fact of our experience; the worth of the soul to God, and its dependence upon Him; the origin of evil, not in nature, nor in matter, nor in a transcendent evil spirit or spirits, but solely in the misused freedom of the will; the overcoming of all evil by the invasive influences of God's grace in Christ; the historic struggle to relate grace and freedom in the doctrines of the Church; the development of true personality through social service, and its claim to further advancement and completion in another world,—these are the vastly interesting and important topics with which the volume deals.

The Baptists are to be congratulated on the fact that such high themes as these can be handled with so much exact scholarship and philosophic grasp by one of the younger generation of their college tutors. On some points raised, such as those of socialism, universalism, the seat of authority in religion, and the cosmic significance of the Atonement, the remarks of Mr. Robinson are tantalizingly brief. Perhaps he has felt that the discussion of these topics would carry him beyond the region of anthropology proper. If so, the illuminating suggestions he has thrown out on these and other themes can only lead us to hope that he will be able to return to them, and deal with them at greater length, in another volume.

R. H. COATS.

Birmingham.

An Important Discovery.

MAJOR SANTOS FERREIRA, Librarian to the War Office in this city, and a studious antiquarian, claims to have discovered four separate alphabets, whereby he has been enabled to read on old coins, etc., inscriptions which have hitherto been supposed to be in an illegible Celtiberian language. Florez' *Medallas de las Colonias de Espana*, pub-

lished at Madrid in 1758, includes steel engravings of the coins of the ancient Phoenician and Greek colonies existing in this peninsula for ten centuries previous to the Christian era. These coins of Gades, Emporia, Sagunto, Obulco, etc., give as a rule the name of the colony in Latin or Greek, but have besides another inscription in this unknown speech. My friend's discoveries disclose this to be Hebrew or some language allied to that, and the inscriptions reveal that these Hebrew colonists were Baal-worshippers. Among the names which occur is one Ælish with an extended form of Ælushtaena. This Major Ferreira considers to be Lisbon and Lusitania, the province of which it was the capital. As Emporia is also found in the form Emporitan there seems some ground for this surmise. Lisbon is in Portuguese pronounced Lishboa, and it would indeed be interesting if the Elishah of Ezk 27⁷ should prove to be the city from which I write. One coin bears on it *Laelaeshbon Baal ushae*, which Major Ferreira translates 'Baal regards Lisbon with favour.' Is there any ground for supposing that the Israelites of the Northern Kingdom were by the Assyrians exiled to this peninsula? These coin inscriptions make it clear that a Baal-worshipping people, speaking some Hebrew dialect, were resident in Emporia, in Catalonia, Obulco near Cordova, and this Ælish for many centuries before the time of Christ.

Another of the four alphabets discovered by Major Ferreira has enabled him to read the inscription on an ancient lead tablet at Madrid. This proves to be an edict of Nabuchodonoser expelling the Jews of his western possessions, after the capture of Jerusalem, and ordering that those residing in Lusitania should be sent to Tamar.

P.S.—A letter to hand from the Keeper of Coins in the British Museum seems to indicate that any Hebrew or allied inscriptions under guise of what has been regarded as Celtiberian inscriptions on the ancient coins of this peninsula is unknown to him. I have followed Major Ferreira far enough in his decipherings to be confident that the inscriptions cover Hebrew or Syrian names and mottoes. This, Mr. Grueber fears, cannot be proved. This position of his gives quite a fresh value to my friend's discovery. Could no British Hebrew scholar give his attention to this matter, which promises to give so

much new light on the settlement of the Jews after the downfall of the Northern Kingdom?

R. M. LITHGOW.

Lisbon.

A New Plea for Evangelism.¹

THIS book, though the work of a Scotsman well known and honoured in his own country, comes to us with a Canadian imprint as an incidental fruit of the author's lifework in the great western Dominion. Something of the urgency of Canadian conditions speaks to us in these pages; still more clearly do we hear in them the urgency of Professor Kilpatrick's heart. The title must not be misconstrued as if it promised us a piece of learned historical research. While the book is the work of a trained and expert thinker, it is practical in every syllable, and emphatically claims to be taken as a contribution to practical theology. Evangelism of the New Testament type, not the evangelism of New Testament days, is its theme.

The dedication is offered to Dr. Kilpatrick's venerable father, and the preface acknowledges indebtedness to Principal Lindsay and Professor Denney. Part I. is more strictly Biblical, yet it construes its Biblical materials in the light of great dogmatic or evangelistic principles. It begins with Old Testament conceptions of salvation not in their primitive externality, when, as Principal Franks says in his excellent *Century Bible Handbook*, salvation meant 'prosperity' (so even Ps 118²⁵), but as found in the Deutero-Isaiah, or in echoes from him. From this elevation it is easy to pass straight on into the New Testament, where once more there is something of the dogmatic in the presentation of the whole of New Testament Scripture as a unity, everywhere proclaiming 'Christ, Christ risen, Christ crucified.'

Part II. touches lightly upon Church History. A few pages are given to the pre-Reformation Church; then the Churches of the Reformation are dealt with—Germany, Scotland, England, the United States. No reader should miss the impressive quotation from Richard Cameron the Covenanter upon p. 106. Alike in Scotland and in the United States the historical sketch of evangelism leads up to D. L. Moody and ends with him. Dr. Kilpatrick

insists upon separating 'evangelism' from 'revivalism'—in this way: evangelism is the Church's constant duty; revival is the gift of God, to come when He pleases; though it will not permanently be withheld from faithfulness and prayer. At the same time, Dr. Kilpatrick indicates that the defective or questionable features of earlier revivals almost entirely disappeared when Moody was the mainspring and regulator of the work. Part III., on Evangelism in the Modern Church, first deals with the power—Prayer, the Word, the Spirit of God; then with the spheres—urging the duty of seeking to win souls to Christ everywhere; in the home or Sunday School during childhood; in the regular services of Christian worship; by more special and direct efforts. Other things are not forgotten, but such evangelizing is urged on the conscience of every Christian as the Church's central duty. One appendix, by the Rev. J. G. Shearer, D.D., of the Canadian Presbyterian Church, gives detailed advice regarding the conduct of simultaneous missions. Another appendix reprints a letter to young missionaries by Dr. Kilpatrick.

The evangelism Dr. Kilpatrick loves is very earnest and ethical. He does not conceive the possibility of a conversion which is not at the same time a self-consecration to the service of God and man. Salvation in the Bible is 'dynamic.' It is 'God in action.' Apart from this ethical strain, Dr. Kilpatrick makes no concessions to the modern spirit but walks steadily in the old paths. If a theological restatement is desirable, we hear nothing about it. Moody's attitude to the Bible, precritical in every jot and tittle, is spoken of as if it had been exemplary and normal. One does not disparage the noble personal worth of Moody in taking a very different view. It might have been helpful to meet with a clearer recognition of distinctively present-day difficulties and needs. Dr. Kilpatrick has judged differently. He speaks simply of the permanent Christian truths, as he conceives them.

The gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ comes to the world declaring to all who hear it that the presence and salvation of Jesus Christ is absolutely necessary to every man; and again, that, for man or for society, the presence of Jesus Christ is absolutely sufficient. In preaching Christ, we have not merely to assert that these things are true; we have so to bear witness to them that sometimes at least, by God's grace, we may carry the conscience of the hearer with us; till he sees himself, naked

¹ *New Testament Evangelism*. By T. B. Kilpatrick, D.D., S.T.D., Knox College, Toronto. Toronto: The Westminster Company Limited, 1911.

and miserable; till he sees Christ, and the glory and grace of God in Him. This is an immense task, which only God Himself can achieve in us and through us. May there not be dangerous simplifications of our task? If, instead of saying, Christ is absolutely necessary, Christ is divinely sufficient, we allow ourselves to say, Conversion is absolutely necessary, conversion is absolutely sufficient—is not something lost? I thought so when, in my fierce youth, I tried in a pamphlet to prove ‘the Insufficiency of Revivalism as a religious system.’ Since then I have learned to admit that, in a sense, revivalism itself is one of those imperfect methods through which God condescends to work; though, in making that admission, I desire to regard conversion as something less miraculous—something, so to say, less absolute—than the old theology made it. I am not sure whether Dr. Kilpatrick would have any patience with my reserves and qualifications; but, such as my lights are, they forbid me to waive these reserves.

It is needful to be loyal to the whole rich inheritance of grace and truth which comes to us in Christ’s gospel—the most precious thing in all the earth or all the heavens. There are plenty of enemies who attack it; there are plenty false friends who would filch it from us in fragments. We wish God-speed, in the Master’s name, to earnest Christian evangelism. But there are some souls who may be kept outside the Kingdom of God if there is nothing offered them except the usual forms of religious appeal. We may blunder and fail in seeking to help these little ones of Jesus Christ’s. Still the effort must be made. It, too, is part of the service of the gospel. Shall not the scribe instructed unto the Kingdom of God bring forth from his treasure things *new* and old?

R. MACKINTOSH.

Lancashire College.

The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East.¹

THIS Manual of Biblical Archæology, translated by Mrs. C. L. Beaumont, with Rev. Dr. C. H. W.

¹ *The Old Testament in the Light of the Ancient East* (Manual of Biblical Archæology), by Alfred Jeremias, Lic. Dr.; ‘Theological Translation Library,’ vols. xxviii. and xxix. Translated by C. L. Beaumont; edited by Rev. Canon C. H. W. Johns, Litt.D. London: Williams & Norgate, 1911. Two vols., 25s. net.

Johns as editor, is a work of absorbing interest, and is certain to be of the utmost service to students of the Old Testament.

The Editor’s Introduction does full justice to the author’s diligence in research and to his theoretical standpoint. ‘His (Dr. Jeremias’) work is extremely valuable as a very full contribution to Biblical archæology, and, whatever may be thought of his theory, we owe him our best thanks for making available rich stores of illustrative material for understanding the setting of the Old Testament.’

The theory is allied to the ‘Pan-Babylonian’ (or better, Ancient Oriental) conception of the universe, which the author seeks to bring into relation to the primary ideas of the Biblical writers. Dr. Jeremias sets forth his theory with praiseworthy restraint, and shows himself an unsparing critic of extravagance in writers supposed to be of the same school of thought.

He holds by a common mythological ancestry for the ideas current in the Ancient East, and rejects the theory of a borrowed literature (vol. i. p. 193). The methods of literary criticism in seeking to account for likeness and diversity in ancient literatures are freely criticised, while emphasis is laid upon ‘the wandering of tradition’ to accomplish the selfsame result (‘. . . one must be careful of the acceptance of the idea of a borrowed literature. The material has travelled.’ See under ‘Deluge,’ vol. i. p. 273).

The first three chapters are of an introductory character. They deal with the Ancient-Eastern Doctrine and the Ancient-Eastern Cosmos, with Babylonian Religion, and with Non-Biblical Cosmogonies. This section shows evidence of much thought, and is worked out in elaborate detail, with an alluring list of parallels from many quarters. One of the best features of the work is the copious illustration from extraneous sources.

In the commentary on the books of the Old Testament, passages having ‘astral’ significance are starred, as an accommodation to those who have not yet been able to grasp the novel idea, as also to facilitate the recognition of the subject for those who wish to penetrate the realm of astral motifs.

Dr. Johns in his preface, while not committing himself to the theory, pleads for suspended judgment, adding that confirmation or refutation is near at hand. To this one may readily subscribe.

In the very important section, vol. i. pp. 79-82, Dr. Jeremias addresses and answers the question:—In tracing the mythological allusions, how much of historical circumstance is to be left? One is glad to find that a maximum of historicity is conceded. In regard to the Patriarchs, e.g., Jeremias writes (vol. ii. p. 45): 'Wellhausen worked out from the opinion that the stories of the Patriarchs are historically impossible. It is now proved that they are possible. If Abraham lived at all, it could only have been in surroundings and under conditions such as the Bible describes. Historical research must be content with this.'

Dr. Jeremias' findings on matters of primary importance are by no means indefinite, and in cases they are very pronounced. On the question of child-sacrifice he writes (vol. i. p. 348), in connexion with the jars found with the remnants of masses of bodies of children: 'Sellin and others have concluded *child sacrifices*. *We wish emphatically to differ from this hypothesis*. They buried the children in the houses, which is certified by the latest graves found in Assur, and when it was possible, in the neighbourhood of the sanctuaries. Also the "passing through fire" of the first-born was not human sacrifice, but was a ceremony of the solstice festival. Human sacrifice, spoken of with horror of the King of Moab (2 K 3²⁷), must have only taken place very occasionally.' To the same effect is vol. ii. p. 141.

Equally emphatic is the parenthesis, vol. ii. p. 6 '(the so-called "second dynasty of Ur" must be abandoned).'

The geographical notes are of extreme interest, but in the localization of places there is in many instances a departure from the traditional finding, and in this Jeremias may or may not be correct. See vol. i. pp. 284, 285 ('Elishah,' 'Tarshish,' 'Kittim,' etc.), and vol. ii. p. 98 ('Mount Sinai').

Regarding the vexed question of the campaigns of Sennacherib (d. 681) in Palestine, Dr. Jeremias argues for two (three, according to the Biblical record), the first in 701, and the second subsequent to the year 691. Contrast with this Rogers, *History of Babylonia and Assyria*, vol. ii. pp. 204, 205: 'For twenty years longer did Sennacherib possess the power of Assyria, but he never invaded Palestine again.'

Jeremias is quite ready to accept textual emendation, and where his finding follows upon such

correction, the result must be received with caution. In this connexion it may be said that the Hebrew transcription, and especially the Hebrew original, has suffered badly in the course of printing, and a number of alterations have to be made. The same remark applies to cross references and to Biblical passages quoted. In all about 200 passages have been marked for correction. In the multitude of references, Biblical and other, the wonder is that mistakes are not more numerous. Many errors arise from the absence of uniform spelling and lack of accents and diacritical marks (e.g. Gomorrha (ah), Ea (Êa), Haran (Harran), Ashtoreth (Ashtoroth), Ashtarte (Astarte), Chaldean (Chaldean), etc. In some instances confusion arises through failure to distinguish vols. i. and ii. Palpable mistakes in spelling will be found (vol. i. pp. 123, 131, 170, 216, 240, 282, 351; and vol. ii. pp. 27, 40, 169, 172, 204, 243, 282, 317). Among errors of other kinds may be instanced: Vol. i. p. 45, 'from 17th of the second month till 17th of the seventh month = 150 days (a half year!).' The anniversary volume, by Hilprecht, is really in his honour, vol. i. p. 51.

The translation reads very smoothly, and appears to be very carefully done.

WILLIAM CRUICKSHANK.

Kinneff.

‘Together.’

A LARGE number of New Testament words are compounded with *σύν*, and wherever they occur they suggest aspects of 'association, community, fellowship, participation' (Thayer). They are often applied to persons 'united, or all in one.' They fall into two classes: (1) referring to the association of Christ and Christians; (2) referring to the association of Christians with one another.

This twofold 'solidarity' is one of the characteristic realities of Christianity, and suggests the secret and inspiration of very much that belongs to Christian life and service. The prominence given to words compounded with *σύν* is particularly striking in Ephesians, Philippians, and Colossians, one single verse sometimes including two or three or four occurrences (Eph 2²¹ 3⁶, Ph 4³). The emphasis on Christian 'solidarity' in these Prison Epistles is very significant.

I. CHRIST AND CHRISTIANS TOGETHER.

1. In crucifixion, *συνσταυρώω*, Ro 6⁶, Gal 2²⁰.
2. In death, *συναποθνήσκω*, 2 Ti 2¹¹; cf. Ro 6⁹.
3. In burial, *συνθάπτω*, Ro 6⁴, Col 2¹².
4. In quickening, *συνζωοποιέω*, Eph 2⁵, Col 2¹³.
5. In resurrection, *συνεγείρω*, Eph 2⁶; *συνηγέροην*, Col 2¹² 3¹.
6. In life, *συνζάω*, Ro 6⁹.
7. In growth, *σύμφυτος*, Ro 6⁵.
8. In form, *σύμμορφος*, Ro 8²⁹; *συμμορφίζω*, Ph 3¹⁰.
9. In ascension, *συνκαθίζω*, Eph 2⁶.
10. In heirship, *συνκληρονόμος*, Ro 8¹⁷.
11. In suffering, *συνπάσχω*, Ro 8¹⁷.
12. In sympathy, *συνπαθέω*, He 4¹⁵.
13. In work, *συνεργέω*, 2 Co 6¹.
14. In journeying, *συνπορεύομαι*, Lk 7¹¹ 24¹⁵.
15. In glory, *συνδοξάζω*, Ro 8¹⁷.

II. CHRISTIANS AND CHRISTIANS TOGETHER.

1. In discipleship, *συνμαθητής*, Jn 11¹⁶.
2. In growth, *συναυξανῶ*, Mt 13³⁰.
3. In prayer, *συμφωνέω*, Mt 18¹⁹.
4. In joy, *συνχαίρω*, Lk 1⁵⁵, 15^{6, 9}.
5. In comfort, *συνπασακαλέω*, Ro 1¹².
6. In imprisonment, *συναιχμάλωτος*, Col 4¹⁰, Philem 23.
7. In suffering, *συνπάσχω*, 2 Co 12²⁶; *συνπαθέω*, He 10³⁴; *συνκακοπαθέω*, 2 Ti 1⁸ 2³; *συνκακουχέω*, He 11²⁵; *συνδέω*, He 13³.
8. In service, *συννπουργέω*, 2 Co 1¹¹; *συνεργός*, Ph 2²⁵ 4³, Philem 24.
9. In travel, *συνπαραλαμβάνω*, Ac 12²⁵ 15³⁷, Gal 2¹; *συνέκδημος*, Ac 19²⁹, 2 Co 8¹⁹.
10. In spiritual bonds, *συνδεσμός*, Eph 4⁸, Col 2¹⁹ 3¹⁴; *σύνζυγος*, Ph 4³.
11. In spiritual servitude, *σύνδουλος*, Col 1⁷ 4⁷.
12. In natural ties, *συγγενής*, Ro 16⁷.
13. In national kinship, *συμφυλότης*, 1 Th 2¹⁴.
14. In home life, *συνοικέω*, 1 P 3⁷.
15. In spiritual kingship, *συμβασιλεύω*, 1 Co 4⁸, 2 Ti 2¹².
16. In discipline, *συναθλέω*, Ph 1²⁷ 4³; *συναγωνίζομαι*, Col 4¹².
17. In warfare, *συνστρατιώτης*, Ph 2²⁵.
18. In official ministry, *συμπρεσβύτερος*, 1 P 5¹.
19. In election, *συνεκλεκτός*, 1 P 5¹³.
20. In imitation of Christ, *συνμιμητής*, Ph 3¹⁷.
21. In spiritual participation, *συμμέτοχος*, Eph 3⁶ 5⁷.

22. In harmonious progress, *συναρμολογέω*, Eph 2²¹ 4¹⁶.

23. In spiritual building, *συνοικοδομέω*, Eph 2²².
24. In sympathy, *συμπαθής*, 1 P 3⁸.
25. In citizenship, *συμπολίτης*, Eph 2¹⁹.
26. In testimony, *συμμαρτυρέω*, Rev 22¹⁸ (T.R.).
27. In spiritual compactness, *συμβιβάζω*, Eph 4¹⁶, Col 2¹⁹.
28. In spiritual partnership, *συγκοινωνός*, Ro 11¹⁷, 1 Co 9²³, Ph 1⁷; *συγκοινωνέω*, Ph 4¹⁴, Rev 18⁴; ctr. Eph 5¹¹.
29. In feeling, *σύνψυχος*, Ph 2².
30. In a spiritual body, *σύνσωμος*, Eph 3⁶.
31. In heirship, *συνκληρονόμος*, Eph 3⁶, He 11⁹, 1 P 3⁷.
32. In death, *συναποθνήσκω*, 2 Co 7³.
33. In life, *συνζάω*, 2 Co 7³.
34. In glory, *συνδοξάζω*, Ro 8¹⁷.

The more we ponder the latter class of passages, the more clearly we shall see the impossibility of a purely individualistic Christian life. To be a saint, we need the 'communion of Saints.' And the more we ponder the former class, the more we shall learn that the secret of all power for Christian living is in union and communion with Christ.

W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS.

Wycliffe College, Toronto.

The Pointing of the Tetragrammaton.

I.

ON p. 423 I had to ask why to the Tetragramm on the title-pages of the A.V. of 1611 an accent is added, now I must ask why the pointing of the Tetragramm in the *Codex Edinburgensis* without Cholem is said to avoid the 'irregularity of Waw having two vowels' (see p. 438). But Waw has not two vowels; the Cholem belongs to the preceding *He*; and if the dot be placed upon Waw, as is frequently done in MSS., it is no irregularity; it has its parallel in *הַיָּה* (Ec 2²², Neh 6⁶). The pointing with Sewa and Qamets only seems to me to have its analogy in the pointing of the Tetragramm as *וָו*, when written with two Yods.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

II.

My friend Dr. Nestle takes me to task for speaking of the pointing of *הַיָּה*, where *י* has a vowel-

point above and below as an 'irregularity.' The point is this: Apart from הָהָ, can a consonantal ו be the bearer of *two* vowel signs, its own proper vowel and the Cholem of a preceding open syllable? The current texts show a curious lack of consistency in this matter. For example, to take the word cited by Professor Nestle, I find הָהָ (Neh 6⁶) not only in the Bible Society's text, but even in Kittel's and Ginsburg's, while in Ec 2²² all three have what I believe to be the correct form הָהָ. The same inconsistency will be found in the inflection of the participle of קוה; e.g. Kittel and Ginsburg have וְקוֹ, Ps 37³, but וְקוֹי, Is 40³¹, קוֹי, Is 49²³ (the two latter the correct forms). These inconsistencies probably go back to Jacob ben Chayyim's text (1524-25). In the Edinburgh Codex the Cholem is always written above and to the left of its consonant, שְׁ, הָהָ, קְדָשׁ, etc.

The same inconsistency appears in our texts with regard to Cholem followed by Aleph. According to Ges.-Kaut., *Gramm.*, § 8 f., we ought not to write בָּא but בָּאֵם; Ginsburg, however, writes בָּא as well as בָּאֵךְ.

The preceding lines were written at a distance from books of reference. I now find that this matter of the correct position of Cholem in the proximity of ו, א, and ש has been exhaustively discussed by Ed. König in his *Lehrgebäude*, i. 44-49. See especially p. 46, where, after pointing out, as I have done, the inaccuracies and inconsistencies of modern editors, Kittel adds: 'To be consistent, therefore, we ought not to print הָהָ!' Finally, let me say I was mistaken in speaking of the pointing הָהָ of Codex Edinburgensis as a 'peculiarity.' From a personal inspection of typical MSS. in the British Museum, I find that the oldest MSS. have הָהָ much more frequently than הָהָ, a point which seems to have escaped the notice of scholars.

A. R. S. KENNEDY.

Edinburgh.

Is the Parable of the Unjust Steward pure Sarcasm?

No parable of our Lord presents so many difficulties to the average reader. Latham, in his *Pastor Pastorum*, emphasizes the fact that the parable was spoken to the disciples, and from this he

concludes that it was meant for them exclusively, and was a warning against an imperious and exclusive spirit. But St. Luke expressly tells us that the parable stirred up the wrath of the Pharisees (16¹⁴).

Two principles are generally to be observed in our Lord's use of parables: (1) That He has some one definite lesson in view (Latham rightly contends against attempting to force a meaning into every detail); (2) that He sums up that lesson at the end of the parable, unless its meaning is fairly obvious.

Now may it not be that our Lord spoke this parable to His disciples in the hearing of the Pharisees, and that He directs it against the Pharisees? If this is so, Lk 16⁹ really amounts to a *reductio ad absurdum*, and can be rendered as our A.V. renders it, but with a mark of exclamation, and reading ἐκλίπη with best MSS. instead of ἐκλίπητε, 'Make to yourselves friends of the mammon of unrighteousness; that when it fails, they may receive you into everlasting habitations!' This summing up would, on the face of it, show to both Pharisees and disciples the utter foolishness of the position which the Pharisees took up. This also avoids the strained rendering of ἐκ, 'by means of,' adopted by R.V.

Applying this to the parable. The 'unjust steward' represents the Pharisees and Scribes, and follows on the teaching of the previous parable about the Elder Son (Lk 15²⁵⁻³²). It also leads on to the teaching of the next parable, that of Lazarus and the Rich Man (Lk 16¹⁹⁻³¹).

The wasting of the goods, and subsequent offering of easier terms to the Lord's debtors, will then refer to the Pharisees' method of interpreting the law to suit their own convenience. This is referred to by our Lord, in 16¹⁵, 'Ye are they that justify yourselves in the sight of men; but God knoweth your hearts: for that which is exalted among men is an abomination in the sight of God.' He goes on in v. 18 to give an example of this offering of 'cheaper terms,' by attacking the Pharisees' lax teaching with regard to divorce.

If, then, our Lord's primary summing up of the parable in v. 9 is simple and (to His hearers) obvious sarcasm, the real summing up of the parable is in vv. 10-13, 'If therefore ye have not been faithful in the unrighteous mammon, who will commit to your trust the true riches?'

It is true that this interpretation of the parable involves a difficulty in v.⁸ which states that 'his lord commended the unrighteous steward because he had done wisely'; and if 'the lord' must necessarily represent God, we are almost compelled to regard these words also as being ironical.

But the chief figure in the parable is the steward, and it is from him and his actions that the lesson is drawn. This being so, it is possible that 'the lord' was used by Jesus Christ in an indefinite sense, as representing public opinion or the force of circumstances.

R. L. COLLINS.

*Bishop Wilson Theological School,
Isle of Man.*

John ii. 4.

IN *The Tablet* of May 27th, p. 1911, there is a fine poem by G. R. Woodward, entitled 'Sancta Maria, ora pro nobis.' It makes use of the story of the wedding at Cana, to enforce this prayer. It begins:

Holy Mary, pray for us:
Jesus, an it may be thus,
Shall, in answer to thy plea,
Grant whate'er we ask of thee.
It was ever thus of old,
In the Gospel we are told,
When thou wast in Galilee
And at Cana, He with thee, etc.

The deciding lines are:

Thou didst to thy Son Divine
Simply say: 'They have no wine.'
'Lady, what is that,' quoth He,
'Unto thee and unto Me?
Not as yet Mine hour is come.'

There can be no doubt that this translation, 'What is *that* unto thee and Me,' is a misrepresentation of the sense of this *phrase*, which occurs at least 10 times in the Bible, besides our passage; 5 times in the Old Testament, from Judges 11, 12 onward; and 5 times in the New. Jesus did not wish to say: The matter does not belong to us both, neither to Me nor to thee. But it is interesting to learn that a classical scholar like Fr. Blass adopted the same sense, reading after the paraphrase of Nonnus, *τί ἐμοὶ ἢ σοί*. Is this view to be found elsewhere? Contrast with it Augustine,

who, in assimilation to Mt 16²³, quotes the passage thus: '*Recede a me mulier; mihi et tibi quid est; nondum venit hora mea*' (*De vera relig.*, t. i. 757).

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

Genesis xlv. 23.

WHAT did Joseph send to his father? According to the common translation: (1) Ten asses laden with the goods of Egypt; (2) ten she asses laden with corn and bread and meat (R.V. victual) for his father by the way. But after the Hebrew (סוף) it seems that an interpunction mark must be inserted after 'bread,' that the sense is: (2) Ten she asses laden with corn and bread; and (3) victual for his father by the way.¹ Another view is taken by Jerome: And to his father he sent in the same manner, *i.e.* gifts as he had given to Benjamin (three hundred pieces of silver and five changes of raiment). In the last clause Jerome omits the 'victual.' The same view of the first clause is taken by the Septuagint and the Syriac Versions. As neither Spurrell in his Notes, nor Sinker in his Commentary, quotes the renderings of the Septuagint and the Vulgate, it is perhaps worth while to call attention to them.

EB. NESTLE.

Maulbronn.

'Ἀδελφός and 'Ἀδελφή as Terms for 'Husband' and 'Wife.'

WHEN the editors of the Greek papyri discovered in Egypt met with the word *ἀδελφή* used by a man in a letter to a woman, and *ἀδελφός* used by a woman writing to a man, in a context that implied wife and husband, they were at a loss to explain it. Thus on P. Brit. Museum, 42 (B.C. 168), 'Ἰσιὸς Ἡφαιστίωνι τῷ ἀδελφῷ χαίρειν, Witkowski (*Epistulae Privatae Graecae Lipsiae*, 1906), says, p. 37, 'Isias potius uxor quam soror Hephaestionis fuisse videtur'; and on P. Oxy. 744 (1 B.C.), p. 97, 'Ἰλαρίων Ἀλιτι τῇ ἀδελφῇ πλείστα χαίρειν, 'Alis fuit Hilarionis soror et, ut videtur, etiam uxor (sic et Gf.-H.).' The book Tobit, written or translated

¹ The original edition of the A.V. (1611) punctuated: 'Ten she asses laden with corne, and bread and meat'; but this punctuation does not mean that the A.V. wished to separate between corn on the one hand, and bread and meat on the other.

about 100 B.C.—100 A.D., and ‘probably the best representative in the Greek Bible of the vernacular as spoken by Jews’ (Thackeray, *Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek*, p. 28), makes the matter quite clear; for we find there a husband addressing his wife as Ἀδελφή. 7^{15B} καὶ ἐκάλεσεν Ῥαγούλ Ἐδναν τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, καὶ εἶπεν αὐτῇ Ἀδελφή (see also 5²¹), ‘and Tobias (84.7) calls his wife Sarah’ Ἀδελφή.

It would seem that ‘brother’ was a general term of affection. 10^{12B} calls Tobias, her son-in-law, Ἀδελφὲ ἀγαπητέ.

Thus Tobit and the papyri throw light on one another.

P.S.—Dr. J. H. Moulton, in his *Prolegomena*,³ p. 6 note, says: ‘In Par P 48 (153 B.C.), there is a letter addressed to an Arab by two of his brothers.’ This is corrected in the German translation (*Einleitung in die Sprache des neuen Testaments*; Heidelberg, 1911)—which is really a corrected and enlarged fourth edition of the *Prolegomena*—into: ‘There is a letter from two Arabs to their ἀδελφός.’ H. SCOTT.

Oxton, Birkenhead.

Ahab's Palace at Samaria.

DR. REISNER has long been known as one of the ablest and most thorough of the excavators and archæologists who have made Egypt their winter (and in his case, also their summer) home. His long-continued work in the cemeteries of Naga ed-Dêr, opposite Girga, was a model of scientific excavation; since then he has been engaged upon still more important work in the pyramid-field of Giza, and more especially in Nubia, where he has been laboriously examining for the Egyptian Government the area which will be submerged after the raising of the barrage at Shellâl. But he is not only an archæologist, he is a philologist and decipherer as well, who has edited Sumerian contracts and hymns and Egyptian hieratic papyri. No more capable scholar, therefore, could have been found to undertake the American excavations at Sebastiyeh, the site of Samaria.

The site did not look very promising at first. It is an extensive one, and is covered to a considerable depth with the ruins and débris of the Roman

period. The excavations were begun in 1908. In 1909 the Græco-Roman stratum was at last penetrated, and beneath it was found a great wall which a fragmentary cuneiform tablet discovered in its neighbourhood showed must belong to at least the age of Nebuchadrezzar. Last year the work was pushed actively on until the rock was reached, the result being the discovery of the remains of a palace which, as we learn from the pottery, must have been that of Ahab.

The palace, which is built of finely-cut stones, twice underwent alteration and enlargement. The original building would have been erected by Omri, the founder of Samaria. His son Ahab added considerably to it, and it was again altered at a later period, probably in the reign of Jeroboam II. But the main building belongs to the age of Ahab, and it is here that Dr. Reisner's most interesting discoveries have been made. On the floor of a store-room he found fragments of jars, more than a hundred of which are inscribed. Between seventy and eighty of the inscriptions are legible, and they show that most of the jars contained the wine or oil that was used in the palace. They are dated in successive years of Ahab's reign, and generally the name of the place (or its owner) from which the wine and oil were brought, as well as the name of the vendor are given. Thus we have: ‘In the 9th year: from Shaphtan: the property of Baal-zamar. A jar of old wine.’ ‘In the 10th year: property of Shemar-yau: from the Hill. A jar with fine oil.’ ‘In the 10th year: wine from the vineyard of the Hill. With a jar of fine oil.’ ‘In the 10th year: from Yazat. A jar of fine oil: the property of Ahinoam.’ ‘In the 10th year: from Abiezer; the property of Shemar-yau. A jar of old wine for Asa: from the Hill.’ ‘In the 11th year: from Shemida: the property of Heles, Aphzak, Ba'ala and Zecher.’ ‘In the 11th year: from Heleq: the property of Asa, Ahimelech, Ba'ala and Baal-me'oni.’ Some of the ostraka relate to the dispatch of messengers.

The forms of the letters resemble those of the Siloam inscription, but are more cursive. This raises the question whether the Siloam inscription has not been referred to too recent a date; satisfactory palæographical evidence on the subject has hitherto been wanting, and it must be remembered that the name of Shiloah, whose ‘waters’ are already mentioned in Is 8⁶, seems to presuppose the existence of the tunnel. The inscriptions are written

in ink, and the words are divided from one another by means of points and lines. As in the Assyrian transcripts of Hebrew names, the name of Yahweh in proper names always appears as 'Y, *Yau*.

These earliest dateable specimens of Hebrew script, however, are not the only inscribed objects that have been disinterred. A fragment of a cuneiform tablet has turned up, on which almost the only legible word appears to be the name of Ahab, so that it may be part of a letter to him from the Assyrian king. Some of the presents sent to Ahab by Osorkon II., the Pharaoh of Egypt, have also been found; among them is a broken alabaster vase with the cartouche of the Egyptian monarch.

Ahab was one of the most powerful of the Syrian kings: at the battle of Qarqar he was able to put into the field no less than 2000 chariots, while Damascus and Hamath could supply only 1200 and 700 respectively, and he furnished the confederacy which opposed the Assyrian invaders at Qarqar with as many as 10,000 foot-soldiers. It is not surprising, therefore, that the Phœnician king wished to ally himself in marriage with so formidable a neighbour, or that his friendship should have been sought by the king of Egypt. He represented, in fact, a revival of the military power of David and Solomon.

A. H. SAYCE.

Oxford.

Entre Nous.

The Great Text Commentary.

The best illustration this month has been found by the Rev. W. Hope Davison, M.A., Bolton, Lancs.

Illustrations for the Great Text for September must be received by the 1st of August. The text is Ps 103^{1, 2}.

The Great Text for October is Ps 118²⁴:

'This is the day which the Lord hath made;
We will rejoice and be glad in it.'

A copy of Emmet's *The Eschatological Question in the Gospels*, or of Scott's *The Kingdom and the Messiah*, or of any volume of the 'Scholar as Preacher' series, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for November is Ps 119¹⁰⁵:

'Thy word is a lamp unto my feet,
And light unto my path.'

A copy of Emmet's *The Eschatological Question in the Gospels*, or Wheeler Robinson's *Christian Doctrine of Man*, or any volume of the Great Texts, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for December is Ps 126⁶:

'Though he goeth on his way weeping,
bearing forth the seed;
He shall come again with joy, bringing
his sheaves with him.'

A copy of Dean's *Visions and Revelations*, or of Wheeler Robinson's *Christian Doctrine of Man*, will be given for the best illustration.

The Great Text for January is Ps 139⁷:

'Whither shall I go from thy spirit?
Or whither shall I flee from thy presence?'

A copy of Scott's *The Kingdom and the Messiah*, or Kennett's *Early Ideals of Righteousness* together with any volume of the 'Epoch Makers' series, will be given for the best illustration sent.

Those who send illustrations should at the same time name the books they wish sent them if successful. Illustrations to be sent to the Editor, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, St. Cyrus, Montrose, Scotland.